



Proceedings
of the
40th Annual Convention
(1973)

ASSOCIATION
OF
MIDWEST FISH AND WILDLIFE COMMISSIONERS



PROCEEDINGS
of the
40th ANNUAL MEETING
of the
ASSOCIATION OF
MIDWEST FISH AND WILDLIFE
COMMISSIONERS
held at
BISMARCK, NORTH DAKOTA
July 16 - 19, 1973

MIDWEST ASSOCIATION COMMITTEES

Committee Assignments for 1973

Appointed By

Russell W. Stuart, 1973 President

RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE:

Richard Wettersten, Chairman, Kansas
Russell Stuart, North Dakota
Robert A. Hodgins, South Dakota
Willard R. Barbee, Nebraska
Harry R. Woodward, Colorado
I. H. "Mutt" Standefer, Oklahoma
Fred A. Prierwert, Iowa
L. P. Voigt, Wisconsin
Gene Gazlay, Michigan
Gene Bass, Indiana
Dan Armbruster, Ohio
Arnold L. Mitchell, Kentucky
G. E. Couldwell, Saskatchewan
R. C. Goulden, Manitoba
F. A. Walden, Ontario
Milo Casey, Minnesota
Anthony T. Dean, Illinois
Carl R. Noren, Missouri

LIAISON PHEASANT COMMITTEE:

L. P. Voigt, Chairman, Wisconsin

PROGRAM COMMITTEE:

Wilbur Boldt, Chairman, North Dakota
Willard R. Barbee, Nebraska
Harry R. Woodward, Colorado
Fred Warders, Kansas

AWARDS COMMITTEE:

Dan Armbruster, Chairman, Ohio
Willard R. Barbee, Nebraska
Gene Bass, Indiana
Arnold Mitchell, Kentucky

PRO HUNT COMMITTEE:

Carl R. Noren, Chairman, Missouri
Milo Casey, Minnesota
Fred Prierwert, Iowa

NOMINATING COMMITTEE:

L. P. Voigt, Chairman, Wisconsin
Harry R. Woodward, Colorado
R. C. Goulden, Manitoba

AUDITING COMMITTEE:

Robert A. Hodgins, Chairman,
South Dakota
Fred A. Prierwert, Iowa
Harry Woodward, Colorado

WATER RESOURCES COMMITTEE:

Willard Barbee, Chairman, Nebraska
Milo Casey, Minnesota
Arnold L. Mitchell, Kentucky
G. E. Couldwell, Saskatchewan

LEGISLATION COMMITTEE:

Gene Gazlay, Chairman, Michigan
Harry R. Woodward, Colorado
R. C. Goulden, Manitoba
Richard Wettersten, Kansas



TABLE OF CONTENTS

General Sessions

TUESDAY, JULY 17:

Call to Order	1
Roll Call -	1
Welcome - <i>The Honorable Wayne Sanstead, Lieutenant Governor of North Dakota</i>	2
President's Address - <i>Russell W. Stuart</i>	5
Keynote Address - "A Critique of the North American Wildlife Policy" - <i>Edward L. Kozicky, Olin Corporation</i>	9
Speakers:	
"Current Plans and Programs of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries & Wildlife" - <i>Vic Schmidt, Deputy Director, B.S.F.W.</i>	18
"Ortega's Meditations on Hunting" - <i>Cliff Morrow, National Rifle Association</i>	32
"Off-Road Vehicle Problems on Federal Lands" - <i>Bob Hoover, Colorado Division of Wildlife</i>	37
"Status of the Set-Aside Cover Problem in the 1973 Farm Bill" - <i>Keith Harmon, Wildlife Management Institute</i>	49
"Status of the Action Report on Fish and Wildlife in the National Water Resources Program" - <i>Jerry Stegman, Chief, River Basin Studies</i>	59

WEDNESDAY, JULY 18:

"New Concepts in Production of Waterfowl and Other Game Birds in Areas of Diversified Agriculture" - <i>Harvey Nelson, Northern Prairie Wildlife Research Center, B.S.F.W.</i>	70
---	----

Business Sessions

WEDNESDAY, JULY 18:

Committee Reports -

Liaison with Pheasant Council <i>L. P. Voigt, Wisconsin</i>	84
Water Resources <i>Willard Barbee, Nebraska</i>	89
Pro-Hunt <i>Charles Purkett, Missouri</i>	91
Awards <i>Dan Armbruster, Ohio</i>	92
Legislation <i>Gene Gazlay, Michigan</i>	94
Audit <i>Fred Priewert, Iowa</i>	106

THURSDAY, JULY 19:

Resolutions <i>Dick Wettersten, Kansas</i>	108
Nominating - Time & Place <i>L. P. Voigt, Wisconsin</i>	115
Installation of Officers, & Adjournment	118

* * *

APPENDIX I -	Report, Agricultural Programs Committee, Midwest Pheasant Council -- Labisky
APPENDIX II -	1973 Report, Midwest Pheasant Council -- Klonglan
APPENDIX III -	Resolutions
APPENDIX IV -	Registration List

PROCEEDINGS
of the
ASSOCIATION
of
MIDWEST FISH AND WILDLIFE COMMISSIONERS

Holiday Inn - Bismarck, North Dakota
July 16 - 19, 1973

First General Session - Tuesday, July 17, a.m.

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by
Russell W. Stuart, 1973 President of the Association.

PRES. STUART: Gentlemen, we will call the 40th Annual
Conference of the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife
Commissioners to order. The first order of business is the
roll call, and I will enlist Wilbur Boldt for this.

Colorado	Bob Evans, Bob Rosette, Bob Hoover
Iowa	Fred Priewert, Jerry Conley
Illinois	
Indiana	
Kansas	Dick Wettersten, Fred Warders, Jack Haley, Fred Sears
Kentucky	
Manitoba	Richard Goulden
Michigan	Gene Gazlay, Charles Harris, Merrill Petoskey
Minnesota	Robert Herbst, Dave Vesall
Missouri	George Dellinger, William Phillips, Charles Purkett
Nebraska	Willard Barbee
North Dakota	Russell Stuart, Wilbur Boldt (Stuart asked the other N.D. personnel to stand, also)
Ohio	Dan Armbruster
Ontario	Ken Irizawa, Donald Johnston, Ken Loftus
Oklahoma	
Saskatchewan	
South Dakota	John Popowski
Wisconsin	Edward Frank, Kent Klepinger, C.W. Threinen, Les Voigt

It was mentioned that Arnold Mitchell of Kentucky had planned to come but a death in the family prevented it.

Note was also made of attendance by representatives of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the Corps of Engineers, the Wildlife Federation, Ducks Unlimited, and the N.D. Outdoor Recreation Agency. They stood and were introduced.

W. BOLDT, NORTH DAKOTA: We have some announcements to make. First, tomorrow morning at 10:30 there will be a Ladies' Dutch Brunch, assembling at poolside. Be sure to let your wives, daughters and others with you, know.

Russ tells me that I forgot to introduce Cliff Morrow from the N.R.A. Would you stand, Cliff?...thank you. Also, we have Chuck Griffith from the National Wildlife Federation back there with Bud Morgan, and I'd like to introduce Bud, too; he's an old friend of all of us here. Thanks.

We have some special events scheduled for the free time tomorrow. We have a couple one-lung aircraft, and if anyone wants to take a chance we'd be happy to give you a little flight over the Garrison Diversion-Garrison Dam area; I'm sure you've heard a lot about that. We will also have some boat rides on the Missouri River tomorrow afternoon. If you are interested in either of these, or in any other points of interest around the Bismarck area, check at the registration desk; we'll have wardens and other Department people available. Tomorrow evening, weather permitting, we will have a barbecue and fish fry over at Fort Lincoln across the river. If this can't be held outdoors, we'll have it in one of the Indian Mounds over there.

Three committee rooms are available for your use. Typewriters and stenographers are at your disposal, and a copy machine is available for resolutions or committee reports.

PRES. STUART: Thank you, Wilb. We're extremely fortunate in having the Governor of North Dakota with us. Actually, he's Lieutenant Governor most of the time, but being as Governor Link is out of the state, we now have Governor Sanstead. I'm extremely proud to introduce him and to have him address this group. Governor Sanstead.

LT. GOV. SANSTEAD: Good morning, and thank you very much for the invitation. I am glad to be here, and hope to stay for at least a portion of the Conference.

It pleases me very much to be able to come before a group such as this, because I believe your roles are vital

to the preservation and balance of nature and yet, at the same time, to maintain recreational areas for the use of our citizens. I would like to say, on behalf of the State, that I hope your stay here in Bismarck is very enjoyable and profitable.

We are, in this state and I think in the Midwest, at the crossroads ...relatively unspoiled by the scars of what has been called "economic progress." We're at that stage of economic development in which we have the opportunity to decide whether we want or don't want ordered or unordered economic progress, or the kind of progress that will develop the full potential of this state. I'm sure you feel the same way about the Midwest; I hope we all feel the same about the Nation. I think we must take the long view. George Santayana once said, and these words have been immortalized time and time again, "Those who fail to study the past are doomed to relive it." We must study the past and prepare for the future. And, we here in the Midwest have certain opportunities, certain advantages, to gain from the experiences of others. This is where I think you people are so important, because you can be directly involved in this area of creating change, as you are in a position to act as educators who deal with the public and also can insure through legislative action the proper management of what we have remaining.

We must begin to openly and democratically determine the future use of our natural resources. The concerns of citizens and problems that they are coming up with are our problems -- all of us who serve in government, whether we work for government or make decisions for government. In other words, your profession can only really be understood and appraised by you. That's why it's good that you come together in sessions such as this, and why I think those people in government are pleased you have meetings in which you talk about the problems and opportunities for the Midwest. You have to be cognizant of the problems existing; you must search for ways to resolve them. You must recommend ways, to both executive and legislative branches of government. It is our responsibility, in the legislative and executive branches, to listen to you -- to seek out your knowledge and your experience. The question is certainly there before us ...What is Man doing to his environment? A superficial view might suggest that our deteriorating environment is presently more of a threat to the quality of human life than to life itself. But who knows how to draw a firm line between the two? I feel we must take a more realistic view of your problems, and accept

the challenge of trying to resolve them. I suspect that many problems you will discuss will be of national concern. Yet, our regional problems and solutions are part of the national problems and solutions, and also must bear examination in that context. We need to adopt in our society's value system a new ethic which will see the land, the water, the air as treasured resources to be carefully managed in the interest of all -- not as cheap commodities to be sold in a reckless drive for quick profit. We have always treasured our diversity in this country. Fragmented action -- every man going his own way with his own technology -- is producing a higher and higher degree of disorder, destroying our environment and wildlife. The rules are obviously going to have to be rewritten, to make technology serve the environment instead of destroying it. This is the challenge I would like to leave you with. Your broad wealth of experience makes you invaluable as a resource to tap, to produce rules for a better environment. We are at a point in our society where we need to balance the twin goals of economic growth and environmental quality. The key word is "balance." A pristine environment has little meaning for a jobless man whose family is hungry, just as material influence is useless if in creating it we continue to foul the earth.

Another area we should look closely at is education. We need to be concerned as much about quality as quantity in education. The world is moving so fast that much of what was absolute yesterday is obsolete today. In such a setting, the critical task is to teach people how to think, rather than what to think. If, as suggested by some futurists, a major drawback to increasing industrialization and environmental protection is the dehumanizing effect of low-skilled, robot-like, assembly line jobs, the ultimate answer is to be found in ceasing to limit the learned skills of too many of our people to the performance of robotized tasks. Direct them, then, in another direction. Create an avenue that is acceptable to the people and befitting to the quality and quantity of life.

No doubt there is a need for more wildlife-oriented recreation opportunities. We should challenge ourselves to evaluate the social and economic benefits from wildlife and determine if there is that need. Young people can be quite essential in this. Armed with the enviable resources of optimism and energy, and motivated with the desire for public service and community betterment, young people continue to illustrate constructive new ways of becoming involved in the social and economic lives of their communities, and

both the young people and their communities benefit from those efforts.

In closing, I would like to leave you with this thought. In the beginning, this nation was bountiful with nature. Probably no one foresaw its near-total destruction. But times have changed, and we need and seek from you, ways in which public policy can respond to the crises of our times. The challenge is yours.

Thank you.

PRES. STUART: Thank you, Governor Wayne. It is our hope that you will be able to take in at least part of the session, and you are welcome to stay for all of it.

Since the roll was taken, two gentlemen representing another Federal agency have come into the room. At this time I would like to introduce Allan Fisk and his colleague Don Aho, with the Soil Conservation Service.

According to the program, at this time you are supposed to have a few words of wisdom from the president of the organization. You are meeting in a rather historic spot insofar as the Upper Great Plains is concerned. Of course, I'm sure you are all aware of the fact that the Missouri River which flows a block or two to the west of us was the main avenue of transportation for the Indians for many years prior to its becoming a White Man's river. In 1804, Lewis and Clark left Wood River, Illinois, and proceeded up the Missouri, across the mountains and down the Columbia, and back again the following year, opening up this entire Northwest Territory. As a matter of fact, the Lewis and Clark Expedition spent the winter of 1804-05 along the Missouri about 40 miles north of here. This area was opened by the fur traders coming both from the south up the Missouri and cross-country from Canada. Actually, it was quite a competition between the Hudson Bay Company and the Northwest Fur Company and several others that were organized here in the States. There was some question, until 1803 when President Jefferson made the Louisiana Purchase from France, as to whether or not this would be a part of Canada or of the United States. Our barbecue Wednesday evening will be over across the river at Fort Lincoln, which was established back in the 1870's to protect the surveying crews which were running the line for the Northern Pacific Railroad (now Burlington Northern), and because the Indians were a little resentful at that time it was necessary to have some military posts up and down the river to protect these surveying crews. As a

matter of fact, Fort Lincoln is where General Custer was stationed when he made his big mistake of going into Montana and the Little Big Horn.

Now, to get down to some of the things I want to say... Very likely you have noted that a theme was not selected for the Conference. The only theme that I thought pertinent is rather pessimistic, and would not look good in print. If I had selected one, it would have been "Many Problems -- Few Solutions." I will address myself to a few of these problems for the next few minutes.

As I analyze it, our problems can be divided into two major categories. These categories are (1) those problems that the wildlife manager (State and Federal) bring on themselves; and (2) those that are brought on by human population pressures and our way of life. Using a little knowledge and common sense, the wildlife manager should be able to avoid bringing on management problems. But, it appears that through ill-advised Federal legislation, International Treaties and Executive Orders, we manage to become embroiled in internecine battles that take time, leave scars and, in general, reduce our effectiveness in attacking the larger, more important environmental problems. A few examples of the above are the outlawing of sport hunting with aircraft, the 1972 Treaty with Mexico, the precipitous ban on the use of toxicants for animal control, and the constant wrangling between the States on the division of the shootable surplus of migratory birds.

Perhaps I should explain my attitude on some of these examples. I agree that some control of aerial hunting was necessary, but this is something that the individual States could have handled without the Federal Government becoming involved. Incidentally, this law was signed by President Nixon in November 1971, and we still do not have the Federal rules and regulations on it.

The Mexican Treaty was too broad, and will needlessly bring about confrontations between the Bureau and the States on the harvest of certain non-game species.

I definitely favored the ban on toxicants for the control of certain animals, but it could have been handled in a more judicious manner. Perhaps some dialogue between the Department of the Interior and the States would have been helpful.

There are several pieces of legislation pending in Congress that could create more problems than they might solve if the recommendations made by the States through

the International Association are not followed. These are the so-called Predator Control Bill and the bills dealing with endangered species.

Another area of concern is the national trend to weaken the power of game and fish commissions by divesting them of the power to hire and fire and to handle budgetary matters. To my knowledge, two State Legislatures introduced reorganization bills this past winter. They were Massachusetts and South Dakota. The last word from Jim Shepard of Massachusetts was that the attempt there was unsuccessful. However, South Dakota did strip its Commission of all power, and it now acts only in an advisory capacity.

Coupled with this weakening of commissions, the anti-hunter and preservationist continue to add to the woes of the wildlife manager. The efforts of these groups to challenge the State's rights to harvest certain species of birds and mammals are familiar to all of us. They are now beginning to challenge the financing of wildlife departments through the sale of hunting and fishing licenses. This approach is rather obvious in some of the bills introduced in Congress. Just recently you were queried concerning your attitude toward a reciprocal fishing license for senior citizens. It is my hope that all of you vehemently opposed the idea. The anti-hunting groups refuse to recognize that wildlife departments have acquired millions of acres of land that is managed primarily for the benefit of all wildlife. They also fail to recognize that the States have about 5,800 enforcement officers in the field compared to about 160 Federal enforcement officers, or a ratio of about 36 to 1. The States and their programs expend more than 214 million dollars annually, as compared with 75.6 million dollars by the Federal wildlife agency. Enforcement of any Federal law must depend on the full cooperation of State enforcement people.

I will briefly mention a few of the National problems that must concern us. The so-called energy crisis is going to have tremendous impact on both our lands and waters, especially in those states having large coal and oil shale resources. Wildlife is given little consideration in most of the reclamation laws passed by the States.

Pollution is still a problem, in spite of many new Federal laws and the Environmental Protection Agency. One of the major problems is that water standards for nutrient loading have not been established.

A week or two ago, there was some cause for optimism in the farm bill, as the Senate had provided for the option

of farmers placing a part of their Set-Aside acreage into permanent herbaceous cover. Since then, the bill has been stalled in the House, and the chances of getting some conscious wildlife benefits out of the farm program are considerably reduced. You will be given a complete report on this, later today.

Another problem that bears our attention is the eliminating of lead shot in the harvest of waterfowl. The transition is fraught with many technical and enforcement problems.

To add to land acquisition problems, we now have to comply with the Uniform Relocation Act, which will add to the cost of land purchases if nothing else. This Act all but eliminated the possibility of negotiating on a willing buyer-willing seller basis. As I understand it, States may be faced with the fact that there may be difficulties in accepting land as a gift in some cases.

In closing, I will mention a few details and an announcement or two.

This Association should give some consideration to closer liaison with the International Association.

It is suggested that the Host State send a rough draft of the minutes of the business meeting as soon as possible to the incoming President, as an aid in making committee assignments. The Transactions are usually not available until a week or two before the Conference.

Apologies must be extended to Bob Herbst of Minnesota and Chuck Harris of Michigan. Their names do not appear in the program as First and Second Vice Presidents, respectively. One other announcement -- Carl Noren of Missouri was the chairman of the Resolutions Committee, but he called me about two weeks ago indicating that a meeting with his state's Governor would preclude his attending this meeting. I then appointed Arnold Mitchell, Kentucky, as new Resolutions Committee chairman. Yesterday morning, Arnold's secretary called to say there had been a death in the family, and would I be so kind as to appoint another acting chairman? I have decided who that is going to be, and will inform him now. Dick Wettersten of Kansas will assume the duties as acting chairman of the Resolutions Committee, and he may call the group together at his convenience. Those submitting resolutions may turn them over to Dick, and a room and a stenographer are available for the Committee. Dick, you have a big job cut out for you.

(coffee break)

PRES. STUART: If you will take your seats we will get the show under way. Incidentally, we will close the registration at 12 noon, so please register by then if you have not done so. We have a few door prizes, and at this time we'll make some drawings.

(...drawings held)

PRES. STUART: We have a gentleman here whose biographical sketch covers about three pages. But, as you all know Ed. Kozicky, I am going to eliminate it. Ed?

DR. KOZICKY: Thank you. Russ called me a couple weeks ago and asked me to "kick off" the Conference as keynote speaker, on a subject of my choice. I'm never smart or intelligent enough to pick something that's non-controversial. One thing has been dwelling on my mind, and I'm going to talk about it today because sometimes the best way to tackle something is to "dammit, get busy and do it."

We all listened to the North American Wildlife Policy last March. It was a voluminous thing, and we came away scratching our heads and wondering what was said. I chose to pick on that subject this morning and at least say what my own thoughts might be. I might get shot down in flames, but somebody has got to start looking at this. I think we are in a period, right now, of a bit of a quandary. Somebody saw fit to change the original Game Policy, and of course we've all gotten away from "game" agencies and "wildlife" agencies, and rightfully so.

A CRITIQUE OF THE NORTH AMERICAN WILDLIFE POLICY

by

Edward L. Kozicky, Director of Conservation,
Winchester-Western Div., Olin, East Alton, Illinois

More than forty years have passed since the original American Game Policy was drafted by Aldo Leopold and his special committee in 1929-30. It was a milestone in its day -- but did it mark the road that we must follow in the 1970's? There was some doubt that it did, so a couple of years ago the decision was made to take a new look at this old policy of American game management and bring it up to date.

A new, longer policy was presented last March at the North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference... a carefully written statement prepared by a distinguished committee of wildlife professionals that was chaired by Dr. Durward Allen.

The committee's task was incredibly difficult and almost certain to be criticized, for it involved revision of a wise and respected document. It was, in a sense, as if a modern Senate committee had been charged with rewriting the Preamble of our Constitution.

The American Game Policy of 1930 was our Magna Carta, and the basis for the transformation of game management into a profession. It was written at a time when the future of our game supplies was at a crossroad. The old, standard solutions for game scarcity -- law enforcement, predator control, refuges and game farming -- had been found wanting. They were useful techniques then, and they still are; but in themselves they were not miracle cures for dwindling game populations.

Through the American Game Policy we were finally able to zero in on the importance of habitat for game restoration. However, with the exception of private areas devoted to game production, game has been -- and evidently will continue to be -- a byproduct of land use; and, of course, we ran up against the economic forces of land use.

Aldo Leopold's committee gave us seven courses of action that have served us well for more than four decades. Briefly, they are:

- (1) Extend public ownership and management of game lands.
- (2) Recognize the landowner as custodian of public game on all other lands, and protect him and compensate him accordingly.
- (3) Determine ways to bring the landowner, the sportsman, and the public into productive relationship with each other.
- (4) Train men for skillful game administration, management and fact-finding, and make game management a profession.
- (5) Recognize the non-shooting protectionist and the scientist as sharing with the sportsman and landowner the responsibility for wildlife conservation and insist on a joint conservation program, jointly formulated and jointly financed.
- (6) Find facts on what to do on the land to make game abundant.
- (7) Provide funds -- with public funds from general taxation to better wildlife as a whole, and with sportsmen paying for all betterments serving game alone, and private funds to help carry costs of education and research.

Certainly, within financial limitations, we have extended

public ownership and management of game lands; we have held to the multiple-use policy (including game management) on public lands and, with a great degree of success, we have fought the forces that would put public lands into single-purpose public use. We have done an admirable job in training professionals for administration, management and fact-finding in game management; and we have filled libraries (and perhaps all too many files) with facts on game animals.

On the other hand, we've never opened the real bottle-neck -- our relations with the landowner, the custodian of public game on private lands. We've offered him everything except money. We have experimented with ways to bring the landowner, the sportsman, and the public into productive relationship with each other -- probably with more failure than success.

The "environmental '70s" have made the general public conscious of wildlife and eager to do something. Although the need to bring the protectionist and scientist together with the sportsman and landowner in sharing the responsibility for wildlife conservation was recognized back in the '30s, it wasn't until the last few years that we were able to generate a model law for all wildlife. We now have such a law, but we still have the problem of getting it adopted by all states and finding ways to finance non-game programs.

It still seems -- as originally pointed out by the Leopold committee -- that funds should be provided from general taxation to better wildlife as a whole, while the sportsman should pay for all benefits serving game alone. But, we are all finding out that the most sensitive nerve in the human body is the one running from the heart to the pocketbook. With great hopes, we watched the ill-fated Missouri effort to tax soft drinks for conservation funding. I like to think that, although our good friends in Missouri may have lost the initial battle, they have not lost the war. Ways and means of financing the management of all wildlife must be found!

In short, the old American Game Policy has served us well. It is a remarkable document -- to be as pertinent today as it was over forty years ago. However, my charge was not to sing the praises of the American Game Policy, but rather to critique the new North American Wildlife Policy.

I have read the new Policy many times, and find it to be a fine dissertation of the trials and tribulations of wildlife in the 1970s. It is an informative and educa-

tional document; however, I found it lacked "courses of action," with priorities on what is needed. Perhaps, with enough interest and discussion, appropriate courses of action will follow.

It is possible that this is a reflection of what has happened to the game management field. Forty years ago we could direct all of our thoughts and attention to game matters. If anything, over the years we have reaffirmed the importance of habitat to the welfare of wildlife.

Frankly, I wonder if -- in trying to be all things to all people, and to take on all environmental ills dealing with all living things, and the concern with policy and management -- we have not exceeded our area of competence. There is little doubt, as the committee points out, "that the easy solutions, if there were any, have already been applied. The future of wildlife is entangled in the total complexity of man's relationship to nature."

It is obvious today that we must at least concern ourselves with a "wildlife policy" and not just a "game policy."

The new Policy's discussions on wildlife uses and values and survival, The Great Problem, are well done and point out the problems of our crowded planet. No longer are we free to do as we choose; we must concern ourselves with how our actions -- both as individuals and as a society -- will affect others.

Much attention is given to the importance of habitat and a discussion of the changes that have occurred, especially in agricultural lands, since the 30s. Just how does one rationalize the production of wildlife on land capable of producing soybeans at \$10 a bushel? Leopold once said that conservation is a bird which flies faster than the shot fired at it, and this certainly is true of any management effort on farm game.

The committee still sees problems that confronted the Leopold group: trespass control, incentives for managing game, and, of course, cooperation with farm planners such as the soil conservation districts and watershed programs.

The problems of forest and range game are a little less fierce than those facing farm game, but the battle to maintain multiple use of our public lands is going to become more intense. If you have any doubts about this, just take a look at "One-Third of the Nation's Land," the report of the Public Land Law Review Commission. The term "multiple use" is brought under fire and an effort

is made to sell us on the concept of "dominant use." "Cutting" cycles have been under attack; however, we are taking a new look at fire as a management tool.

The Policy's discussions on wildlife and grazing, and water and wetlands, are well done. The committee focused attention on the importance of pollution, and spoke out strongly in behalf of bottomlands and their natural functions as flood channels and overflow lands. A crying need for wetland conservation was emphasized, and properly so!

The discussion on wilderness is enlightening, and spells out several well accepted policies and practices for managing such areas.

The section on Hunting: Biology and Sociology contains a good dissertation on anti-hunting sentiment, indiscriminate shooting, and "somewhere and something to hunt." This "unholy threesome" has been with us for years. There is nothing new about it -- I can well remember it in the early 30s. However, the environmental 70s and an imbalance between recreation areas and outdoor enthusiasts has brought the problems into critical focus. Anti-hunting sentiment is a moral and emotional issue, and a distinctly personal one. Non-hunters, even those with an open mind, find it difficult or impossible to really understand the hunter. Our job is not to engage these good folks in an emotional Donnybrook; but, rather, to enlist their financial and political support for total wildlife programs.

We suspect that much of this opposition is not so much "anti-hunting" as "anti-hunter." That is, many of these critics may be wholly opposed to the conduct of certain hunters, rather than to the principle of hunting itself.

The indiscriminate shooter is not new -- but, on a shrinking land base and with a plethora of outdoor gadgets, he is more obvious than ever before. So is his disrespect for laws, land, wildlife and other people. But we can do something about him.

First, we can try to educate him (or, more accurately, we can "prevent" him) through expanded hunter safety training programs that emphasize not just proper gun handling but respect for laws, wildlife, land, companions, and even himself. Call it hunting or outdoor ethics, if you like. Our urbanized population has lost touch with the land, including respect for the land and the landowner. While the sociologists are studying why we have indiscriminate shooters, and why certain people are anti-hunters, we need

to promote mandatory education of our shooters. Europeans, especially the Germans, have done so for ages, teaching respect for the land on which they hunt and the game thereon. We must emphasize quality sport, and de-emphasize the importance of quantity.

And, opinions to the contrary, basically the American hunter is interested in a quality experience and fair play afield. Sometimes we get led astray by what the minority is doing. Public opinion being what it is, we can no longer afford to let anyone with a \$5 bill in his hand purchase a hunting license and go afield. We have a responsibility -- not only to him, but to the resource and the landowner who produces the resource (either public or private) -- to train that individual, at his expense, in proper gun handling AND in outdoor ethics, principles of game management and, in some cases, survival in the open.

The problems of somewhere and something to hunt should not -- and, indeed, cannot -- be the sole responsibility of the state wildlife agency. The hunter must face up to the truth: free hunting is a myth! Hunting does cost, in one form or another, and those who are willing to work or pay for good hunting are entitled to it. Private enterprise should be encouraged to provide more hunting and fishing activities. However, guidance is needed; also appropriate regulations for the benefit of the investor, the sportsman, and the quality of the sport.

We must purge ourselves of the old belief that there is something un-American about paying for the privilege of hunting or fishing on private land.

I have chosen to dwell on the hunting section of the new Policy since my good cohort, John Madson, and I have spent much time pondering the various facets of this subject. And, for your consideration, I would like to present the following suggested courses of action in this particular session.

- (1) Promote the passage of the model non-game wildlife law within your individual state, with appropriate means of funding. This is a must.
- (2) ...This is a rather strong one, and I used to be against it; I have certainly changed my mind... Establish a mandatory hunter safety training program, expanded to include outdoor ethics, principles of game management and, where applicable, survival training -- in addition to proper gun handling.
- (3) Promote private enterprise in the field of wildlife management, and provide competent technical assistance.

Such efforts are not found in leasing hunting rights, shooting preserves, hunting areas and fishing water maintained for private use, and the development of landowner cooperatives for the orderly management of hunting.

I would like to say one other thing which I feel rather strongly about and I know it is a subject of debate. I will call a particular State to say that such-and-such is going on there which is more of a shooting match than it is hunting. The reply will be, "We have nothing to do with it as it's not a native game species." I say to you, that wherever hunting occurs, you do have something to do with it! You cannot afford to let hunting of that sort go on, because the public does not distinguish between quality hunting as you and I know it and somebody's operation of the next thing to a shooting gallery. We must accept the responsibility of being the watchdogs, if you will, over hunting wherever it occurs in our state -- and assure ourselves that it is done in a quality fashion.

The new Policy also contains good dissertations on Natural vs. Artificial Hunting, the Use of Exotics, Predators and Prey, Regulatory and Administrative Problems, and Facts for the Future.

I was disturbed to notice that the section on Public Relations and Education was included at the very end of the Wildlife Policy -- almost as an afterthought. Furthermore, the Policy seemed quite patronizing in its assessment of the quality of information-education programs.

It is my impression that some of the finest examples of motion pictures, editing, writing, and radio and TV programming have emerged from State and Federal conservation agencies -- and not from commercial sources. Yet, the conservation I & E effort continues to grapple with the basic problem of being included at the end of the planning, almost as an afterthought, as in the new Wildlife Policy.

One important element missing in the North American Wildlife Policy is a discussion of funding. Regardless of how admirable a cause or effort may be, it still takes money to accomplish the work. It is also quite obvious that hunting licenses and fees per se will not provide enough revenue to do the job at hand. Most wildlife agencies are operating with ever-tightening budgets, which simply means that they cannot be all things to all people. Hence, ways and means must be found to fund our wildlife efforts. We all know the trials and tribulations of trying to obtain even minor increases in hunting license or fishing license fees within a state.

The problem of funding -- or, rather, lack of funding -- is all-important! If we look back to the American Game Policy and check those items which have met with little or no success, we will find that to some extent they lacked public support; but to an even greater extent, they lacked financing. Our struggle to open more private lands to hunting, or to recreation, has been hampered by the lack of funds. Who is going to finance these programs, and how, is barely mentioned in the committee's report. The "where-with-all" has to be clearly spelled out.

It's unfortunate that the new Wildlife Policy is so verbose and involved. In my opinion, it's a ponderous statement of problems, lacking a concise summary of solutions.

By comparison, the 1930 Game Policy was simple, direct and disciplined....Which is not to say that the resource problems of that time were any less serious than those of today. American wildlife may have been at its all-time low in the late 1920s.

Yet, in spite of the complexity of their problems, it was possible for the authors of the original Game Policy to draft a powerful statement that was the prelude to a remarkable decade of conservation action. Is the new Wildlife Policy the prelude to a similar burst of accomplishment? I doubt it. It is a top-heavy summary of "new" problems, rather than a succinct statement of new solutions. As an appendix to a course of action, it is excellent, but, in itself, it lacks the tough, positive clarity of the original.

I cannot help but wonder if the new Policy reflects certain characteristics of modern wildlife managers. Have we become so bogged down in the complexities of our work that we are unable to see the problems and solutions in clear perspective? The men who wrote the 1930 Game Policy had vision and creative imagination. Their thinking was like a laser beam -- intense and sharply focused, cutting through the murkiness and confusion of resource problems. Are we unable to do as much? Have we learned so much that we are no longer able to reason in clear, direct channels?

Dr. Robert McCabe, in his critique of the 37th North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference in Mexico City, commented on Durward Allen's presentation of "The Need (...at that time) for a New North American Wildlife Policy":

"The history, needs, and a new approach were ably stated. My only caution is that we remember who we are. If wildlife professionals will do the job for which they are trained, the best interests of world environments and man will be served."

Bob McCabe's statement crystallizes my own concern. The authors of the 1930 Game Policy knew exactly who they were, and what they had to do. They had a strength and clarity of vision that may not have been lost in the intervening forty years but which seems to have grown more diffuse -- unable to brightly light the problems and create sharp shadows.

But in spite of these personal criticisms, I regard the North American Wildlife Policy as an excellent educational document. It should be the subject of discussion for many groups like this one. Then, perhaps after a suitable period of time -- and I hope within the next couple of years -- another committee, or the same committee, can begin work on meaningful courses of action which would give those of us facing the day-to-day problems of wildlife management guidelines to follow. And, perhaps even more important, such a committee could include guidelines by which we can inform the public of what our responsibilities are and how we intend to pursue them. We cannot -- and should not -- try to be all things to all people. Let's hold fast to matters relating to wildlife and call upon other disciplines to help with agricultural, forestry, water, social and economic problems.

We owe a vote of thanks to Durward Allen and his committee for accomplishing a monumental task under the pressure of time. They have given us an excellent summary of the state of the art -- a "chopping block", if you like. It remains for us to hew the finished product -- a set of "courses of action" -- from this basic material.

Thank you.

PRES. STUART: Thank you, Ed. Would you stick around? I'm sure there are some questions.

D.WETTERSTEN, KANSAS: Ed, I would first just like to commend you on your subject; and second, for having the forbearance to read the ponderous document. I have gone through it once, and I daresay I never will again.

E. KOZICKY: It is remarkable; if you take that document and read it and say, "What are we going to cut out of it?" -- it all relates. But what we need from it is where to go from here. The basic document is still a pretty good one and it was a tough job to try to revise it.

Incidentally, I have copies of this up here; and also we have finally, just this morning, gotten out the first release on the lead vs. iron shot. I found that, after due course of time, after you put manganese with iron, it's no

longer iron; it's steel. Anyway, I have copies here of the first release on the steel, lead and copper shot. I've tried to get it to all the State people because it was the Midwest that helped us so much in getting this experiment accomplished.

Although I'll probably get shot at, I really feel that we have to have this new Policy. We have to know where we are going, and we must have some hard, fast courses of action.

D. WETTERSTEN, KANSAS: What course of action do you see coming up next on the Policy, as far as its modification, adoption and qualification. Where do we go from here?

E. KOZICKY: I have talked with some of the people who have been involved, and they indicated they have the same basic reaction that you and I have. It's a ponderous presentation with a lot of good material in it, but we are looking for courses of action. I think that maybe in the next year or two we will come out with this.

M. PETOSKEY, MICHIGAN: I served on the committee, and I wasn't exactly sure what the course of action would be. My understanding was that the Policy was set out to be criticized, by groups such as this.

E. KOZICKY: Give it some courses of action; this is the big thing. Looking at the Leopold courses of action, we see that they were basic and they're still beautiful. In reading the old Game Policy, we see that it's still pretty doggone pertinent. But, of course things have changed a bit and there need to be some revisions.

PRES. STUART: Thank you, Ed. That was excellent. The next speaker on the program actually needs no introduction. He's been with the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife for a long time, and we're really interested in what he has to say. At this time I would like to introduce Vic Schmidt, Deputy Director of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Washington, D. C.

V. SCHMIDT: For a long time it's been my lot to follow Ed Kozicky. He was ahead of me at school. I went to work in New Jersey, and lo and behold after several years he turned up there as head of research. I followed him there, and we got involved in a research endeavor on Clapper Rails. He used to be at my door at 5:30 in the morning, and I would follow him to the marsh. Now I find myself here again, following Ed. But I think he had some profound remarks to make, and I think we ought to give him some serious reflection.

Mr. Chairman, participants, and guests, it is my great pleasure to be here today. A respite from the furor and press of Washington business is always welcome -- especially so when it's combined with an opportunity to renew old acquaintances and to mingle with State and Canadian colleagues dedicated to the common cause of properly managing our Nation's fish and wildlife resources.

I have been asked to discuss, today, plans and programs of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. I enthusiastically accepted this invitation because there is quite a bit going on that I would like to report to you. In doing this, I will highlight some of the more pertinent actions which have been accomplished, are in the process of becoming so, or are in the planning stages.

Before I do, however, let me set the stage with a quote from Director Spencer Smith's recent statement to the Congressional Appropriations Committees on this year's budget. It capsules, I believe, the new Bureau management philosophy and sets forth the parameters within which our operations are being carried out. In short, it spells out a basic framework for a new way of doing business. Spencer said this in his testimony on the "Hill."

"I am going to start with a simple, you may say self-evident, premise. This is that the essential function of State and Federal conservation agencies is to serve as guardian and advocate of our Nation's living natural resources. Together we speak and act for all fish and wildlife. The job at hand requires that Federal and State agencies work in concert as professionals to get work done in the most efficient and effective manner. I see this as something more than what is usually called coordinated effort. I see it as mutual recognition that neither the States nor the Federal Government has a patent on professionalism or competency; that there are total fish and wildlife resource needs and priorities and we cannot afford a piecemeal, fragmented approach to resolving those priorities. Recognizing differential capabilities and special responsibilities, we must nonetheless act together in developing objectives in agreeing on priorities for action, and in making decisions on implementing action plans. Then we must move ahead jointly with the tasks necessary for the long-term benefit of the resource. This will result not only in changes in the way we do things but also in which level of government does what part of the job."

Spencer said further:

"The premise I stated also emphasizes our central interest in the resource, and by extension, its habitats, and does not recognize any one user of the resource, special interest group, or particular constituency. The public no longer limits the values of fish and wildlife to utilization of animals by fishermen and hunters. A decade ago these users were the essential constituency of wildlife conservation agencies. Today, our constituencies are not only broader but are far more fragmented. However, we cannot and will not attempt to be all things to all people. If we -- the States and the Federal Government -- fail to serve the total resource by trying to serve only one constituency, we will not only deny our professional and ethical responsibilities, but will find ourselves the targets of growing public distrust."

He concluded:

"Thus, the need to determine objectives and requirements viewed from the total resource standpoint and the need for this Bureau to exercise, with the guidance and assistance of the Congress, the kind of leadership which will result in the best joint effort by the States and the Federal Government."

Now, getting down to more specific things. . . Our boss, Spencer Smith, has been advocating a Federal-State cooperative program in dealing with the International. They, in turn, set up an ad hoc committee headed by Jim Shepard of Massachusetts. At this time, Shepard has received from a number of States their comments on this approach and suggestions on what they feel are pilot efforts. The Bureau is now awaiting a summation report from the Shepard committee. Once we get this, we can sit down and deal with the specific projects recommended for implementation, and have at it.

From my own point of view I would describe the last two and a half years as a period of making order. For example:

- (1) We have assembled a new management team.
- (2) We have assessed Bureau programs, procedures and priorities.
- (3) We have identified areas of overcommitment in terms of money and manpower.
- (4) We have modified Bureau operations to achieve a better program and capability.
- (5) We are optimizing the deployment of our professional talent and we are attempting to imbue the organization with a sense of dedication, enthusiasm and professionalism.
- (6) We have developed a workable set of management prin-

ciples which are carried out by a management structure which stresses teamwork.

- (7) We have adopted a program budget as opposed to traditional organizational oriented budget, which was unwieldy and imprecise.

In short, I feel we have the show on the road and that it's headed in the right direction. This effort has required numerous personnel changes as well as the substantial modifications in our organizational structure which I have mentioned. Of the many changes, one of the most important has been the creation of the new 10-State Region 6, which as you know is headquartered in Denver and is under the guidance of Toar Marston. After the inevitable initial shake-downs we believe this new regional concept is working and we sincerely hope that you share this view. Recent retirements, nearly 100 Bureau-wide, are creating some problems for us but we are moving ahead as rapidly as possible to get highly qualified professionals into vacant key positions, including the Regional Director slots formerly occupied by Trav Roberts and John Findlay. Also, we have created a new position of Assistant Director for Public Affairs. That job has been filled by John Mattoon whom we recruited from the Bureau of Land Management.

To get on with my assigned theme, let me touch briefly on some actions that I know are of mutual interest and concern. First off, crows. Here's the situation in a nutshell.

- (1) A standing depredation order is now in effect for crows, magpies, blackbirds, starlings.
- (2) A Federal Register document will be out soon permitting 124-day hunting season. States can establish such a season on their own -- we ask that they notify us for information purposes.
- (3) When the hunting season document comes out we will contact the States by letter explaining the depredation order and hunting season. At that time we will ask that States using the depredation order provide, in their files, justification for the order in terms of documented depredations for the area and/or time of occurrence.

I need not remind you that, if you'll pardon the pun, the Bureau has been kind of "eating crow" ever since the amendment last year of the migratory bird treaty with Mexico. The water has been muddied on this issue because many people did not realize that the amendment included families of birds not individual species. This was at the insistence of the Mexican Government.

Another touchy subject is dove baiting. Here's what we intend to do about this one.

- (1) We are considering an experimental revision of the long-controversial regulation to make the definition of illegal baiting as clear as possible.
- (2) It is our view that overt or spot baiting is not acceptable, but that any seeding or manipulation of a crop grown in place will be allowable.
- (3) We don't propose such a revision for waterfowl.

Another somewhat controversial experiment has been the point system. It seems that the primary objective of the point system has been missed or at least lost not only by hunters but by waterfowl managers as well. The main objective of the point system is not to permit a large bag limit, but rather to provide a means whereby hunters would not have to identify ducks on the wing before shooting. We did not rush into this one. The experiment was tried only after considerable input from interested sources and much discussion within the Bureau.

We recognize the reordering problem, but still see positive benefits in the point system. Therefore, we have proposed to reduce the incentive for reordering by limiting the range between maximum and minimum bag in the points. Although the reduction from the potential of 10 birds is the most apparent change, the lessening of the high-point bird effect will likely be the most significant in terms of harvest.

The use of iron shot is another subject that has stirred up a fair share of pros and cons. These are the latest developments on iron shot (excuse me, Ed... steel shot!).

- (1) State responses indicate a potential use of about 1.5 million rounds in 1973. Private cooperators--about 45,500 rounds. Estimates for the Bureau program are from 500,000 - 750,000 rounds. These estimates will be influenced by waterfowl hunting prospects this fall, which I will touch upon in just a moment.
- (2) Winchester -- and especially Ed -- met with the Assistant Secretary and Bureau staff on June 29 and presented their evaluation of their Nilo tests. We've requested data and will evaluate it in comparison with our Patuxent tests.
- (3) Remington, Winchester, and Federal have been contacted about ammunition for the program for this fall. Their responses are not complete yet but will be shortly. We will then go back to the States to firm up the program.

Now to the waterfowl forecast, which at the moment is distressing news, but by no means catastrophic. As you may have heard, the joint Bureau and Canadian Wildlife Service recent annual survey of waterfowl breeding populations and habitat conditions in the north central United States and southern Canada was disappointing. The survey showed a decline from last year in both the number of breeding ducks and the quality of wetland habitat. Some survey highlights:

--Heavy April snows and above normal spring rain-fall have helped maintain remaining wetlands in prairie Canada, particularly in the more northerly parklands.

--Here in the Dakotas, wetlands are down one-third to one-half from last year, and the duck breeding population is down 20 to 30 percent. Duck production is expected to be fair to poor.

--In Montana, habitat is generally good except in dry northern areas with duck numbers comparable to last year.

--In southern Alberta, wetlands are only slightly below last year, and breeding populations are unchanged except for pintails, which are considerably down from last year.

--In southern Saskatchewan, habitat conditions range from fair in parklands to poor in southern prairies. Breeding populations are below long term averages and production is expected to be poor.

--In Manitoba, pond counts are down 50 percent from 1972, and pond quality is generally poor. Breeding duck numbers, particularly mallards, are also down. Duck production in southern Manitoba almost certainly will be less this year than last.

--Although northern habitats appear to be somewhat drier than in 1972, breeding populations are generally the same as in recent years. However, in the Northwest Territories, the number of breeding mallards and pintails are down.

--In summary, the 1973 continental duck breeding population is reduced from 1972, and habitat conditions have deteriorated in the important parkland and prairie breeding areas. Production of young in these areas will depend on the amount of rainfall through the rest of the season, but the fall flight of ducks is expected to be down from 1972. As many of you know, we will go into this matter in more

detail at a meeting with the Flyway Councils and others July 26 in Denver.

Now let me turn to legislation. While Congress has been preoccupied with more sensational events, two bills of particular interest to us wildlife managers are in the legislative mill. I speak of the Endangered Species and Animal Damage Abatement Control proposals.

A word about the endangered species bill before I go into detail. Here we have some real problems, not so much among ourselves but because of the differing viewpoints of some who believe that if something is going to be done right then, the Federal Government has got to do it. To illustrate, I quote from a recent editorial in that widely-read opinion molder the Washington Post. Said the Post in commenting on the protection of endangered species:

"Currently several much improved bills are before the Senate Commerce Committee and the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. Whatever bill finally emerges, it seems sensible that the ultimate authority rests with the Federal Government, not the individual States, many of which have proven indifferent to the problem..." (I have added the emphasis).

The Bureau and the Department of the Interior simply do not subscribe to the theory that the Federal Government is Lord on high and the seat of all knowledge, expertise and responsibility. The States have got to have a stake in this type of program, especially as regards resident species. These kinds of misconceptions are damaging to efforts that require State-Federal cooperation, and they have got to be counteracted. It's our joint responsibility to do just that. Some conservation organizations seem to feel that a "one-stop" service is in their best interest. They like to deal directly with the Congress, the Secretary and Assistant Secretary of the Interior and the Bureau Director. They must be convinced that other individuals and levels of government are also involved.

As for the two pieces of legislation, here's how they stand. First, animal damage control. The major features of the proposed legislation are embodied in H.R. 4759 and S. 887. They are:

--Provides for an expanded program of Federal research into methods of animal damage control, predator/prey relationships, damage assessment and socio-economic studies.

--Provides for Federal demonstration of control techniques and other extension services.

--Authorizes Federal financial assistance to the States for carrying out approved control programs. A maximum of \$300,000 on a 75/25 percent basis for the first two years and \$200,000 on a 50/50 percent basis for the third year on. The Government will designate the recipient agency.

--Prohibits field use of chemical toxicants for the purpose of destroying predatory animals, or use of chemical toxicants having secondary poisoning effects against any animal on Federal lands or in approved State control programs except under certain specified emergency situations.

--Repeals the Act of March 2, 1931 (46 Stat. 1468; 7 U.S.C. 426-426b) which directs the Secretary of the Interior to conduct campaigns for the eradication of animals injurious to agriculture, livestock and people.

--Program costs are estimated at \$5.75 million for the first two years for assistance and extension and \$4.25 million thereafter, exclusive of research.

--Hearings were held in the House on March 19, 1973 and in the Senate on March 27, 1973. Additional hearings were those held May 15, 1973 in the Senate Committee on Commerce and June 1, 1973 in Sun Valley, Idaho by the Senate Interior Committee.

The House and Senate Committees are expected to go into Executive Session after the July recess. The working draft of the Senate Committee Print varies significantly from the Administration's proposal by (1) placing further restrictions on the emergency use of poisons (the emergency provision for prevent of irretrievable damage to nationally significant resources was eliminated), and (2) prohibiting the use of traps that do not kill instantly.

Essential changes in the endangered species program are wrapped up in H.R. 4758, H.R. 37 and S.1592. Major features of the proposals:

--Provide for two levels of endangered fish and wildlife: (1) species or subspecies presently threatened with extinction, and (2) species of subspecies likely within the foreseeable future to become threatened with extinction; and over what portion of the range such conditions exist.

--Remove the current ceiling imposed by law on

acquisition of essential wildlife habitat with Land and Water Conservation Fund Act money.

--Prohibit unauthorized import or export, taking possession, sale, delivery and transport of species or subspecies of fish and wildlife listed as presently threatened with extinction, and provide the Secretary with discretionary authority to regulate the import, taking and interstate transportation of animals listed as likely within the foreseeable future to become threatened with extinction.

--Authorize suspension of Federal prohibitions respecting taking within a State or its territorial waters when the Secretary determines that such State has adopted an active program for management and protection of endangered species, including laws which are not less restrictive than Federal prohibitions.

--Clarify enforcement authorities related to warrantless search and forfeiture of seized property, and provide for a criminal penalty for knowingly violating the Act or regulations issued thereunder.

--Provide exception to the prohibition in the Act related to species threatened with extinction for economic hardship for scientific, zoological and educational purposes as well as for certain management activities required for enhancement of the survival of species.

--Encourage international activities for protection, conservation and propagation of endangered species and direct all Federal land managing agencies to use their authorities for protection and conservation of endangered species.

Cost of the program is estimated at \$8 million for Fiscal Year 1975.

At this time it's important to keep in mind that both Committee print drafts change the Administration's classification of endangered species to two separate categories: (1) endangered, and (2) threatened. Both prints include (1) a Federal grant-in-aid program for States entering into cooperative agreement for management of endangered and threatened species found within the state; (2) a study of plants by the Smithsonian Institution; and (3) language to implement the recent International Convention agreed to by principal Nations meeting in Washington. The House print voids Federal law, except with respect to importation, exportation and interstate commerce, when a State enters into a cooperative agreement. The Senate print is expected to approach the Federal/State relationship in a similar manner.

My remarks have been but a brief sketch of a few of the "pieces of action" that have been commanding our attention and energies (and sometimes raising our collective blood pressures) on the Federal scene. There are many others which time will not permit me to discuss in detail.

Before closing, however, just a few words about some additional matters of interest.

I attended a meeting last week in Salt Lake City of our Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Units which, as you know, are located on various university campuses across the country. One important development to emerge from that meeting was discussion of how to make the Unit program more effective in assisting the fish and wildlife professionals in the States and in the Bureau achieve their goals. The Units have now been combined under the Assistant Director for Research, and I believe we can look forward to more significant input.

Important changes also are in the offing in the operation of our refuges. One has to do with hunting, another with recreation policy.

On hunting, the Bureau is reexamining its ongoing efforts. Our goal for hunting on refuges is to stress quality, sportsmanship, ethics -- the amenities of the hunt.

We can't continue to let the hunters who refuse to obey the rules and our poorly managed hunts to continue to supply ammunition for the ever more vocal critics of hunting.

Our new refuge recreation policy will stress wildlife oriented activities -- those that are compatible with the purposes for which these areas were established. Less and less emphasis will be placed on nonwildlife oriented recreation as we move toward phasing out and eventually eliminating those activities that can interfere with management of the resource.

In concluding, I want to re-emphasize the theme with which I began. Each of us -- Federal, State and private citizen -- has a job to do in managing and wisely using our wildlife resources. We can't afford to play the monopoly game. I am not so naive as to suggest that we will always sing a harmonious duet, but at least let's try to follow the same tune.

Assistant Secretary Nat Reed many times has described State-Federal cooperation as an "ecological imperative." I'll buy that. I hope you will too.

Thank you.

PRES. STUART: Thank you, Vic. If you will stay here, I'm sure there are some questions and comments.

D. VESALL, MINNESOTA: We have learned there has been a cutback in funds for the Federal wetlands acquisition program. Minnesota has 75% fee title and 25% easements, so we are concerned.

V. SCHMIDT: Okay, we're talking about the budget process now. When the President's budget was sent to Congress, there was no money for a loan fund. There was \$7 million in there from the Duck Stamp money, for land acquisition. It is a little complicated; just bear with me for a minute. The House report came out and the House, indicating a real concern that this cut took place, almost alluded that they would like to hear more from the Bureau on the wetland acquisition. The Senate report is being marked up now, and I have no idea on how that particular aspect of our budget is going to appear in the Senate. One important point I want to make is how the Bureau prepared its budget in accordance with its allowance. We certainly set forth what we thought was the best mix of programs with the money allotted to us. Yet, there is still a lot of interest in the wetlands program. My best guess is, we ought to see what comes out of the Senate and then out of the Conference Committee.

In terms of what money will be available for expenditure in 1974 -- We had a carryover, I believe, of \$6 million, and I think our outlay of acquisition money for 1974 is pegged at \$9 million unless further changes take place in the budget process.

B. HERBST, MINNESOTA: Are we to understand that you did have a "cap" under which to prepare your budget?

V. SCHMIDT: Yes sir; this is part of the process. We get a first "cap" allowance, and go through the process of meeting the allowance, sometimes setting up what some folks refer to as a "wish list." We certainly try to make our needs known, but in the end process all government agencies, I feel, work with an allowance. You are well aware that the Administration is real serious about the problems of outlays.

K. HARMON, WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE: I understand the wetlands program needs to be extended beyond 1976. I also understand that the staff of realtors working "on the ground" has been reduced. Can this staff be restored if needed?

V. SCHMIDT: Yes; I'm not so sure that there has been a serious reduction, although there have been some realloca-

tions from a management standpoint or, you might say, from a standpoint of competing demands for scarce resources within the Bureau. We have a fixed number of permanent employees, and we try to get them to where they're going to do the most good for the Bureau. I think that much of the change that took place in the wetlands program up in this country was more closely allied with the setting up of Region 6, which certainly encompassed a number of key States formerly attached to the Twin Cities. So, it was a matter of staffing up both Regional offices. We have been giving thorough consideration to ways and means of extending the wetlands program when this comes up in 1976.

J. POPOWSKI, SOUTH DAKOTA: Regarding the point system on waterfowl -- did you say your philosophy is that a hunter would not be required or expected to identify a bird on the wing?

V. SCHMIDT: No; I don't believe I put it in that context. I wanted to clarify that the main objective in the point system is to give the hunter an opportunity to shoot and identify the bird in the bag. He can stay fairly clean if he kills his bird, examines it, and then matches it against the point system.

J. POPOWSKI: Are you saying, for example, with a complete closure on cans and redheads, that if a person shoots a bird and then identifies it in his hand, it is legal?

V. SCHMIDT: Right. But there are other considerations that go into regulations, and one is species management. I think it is a matter of putting together the criteria of a good, sound set of regulations, laying out the standards, and working toward that. The point system has been somewhat of an experiment, and it certainly has taken on well in some states. But in terms of changes, there has been a serious problem of this business of reordering, and this is one of the hurdles we have to get over. We've just got to do something about reordering in the bag. Now, I agree that we ought to encourage hunters to certainly identify birds on the wing. I think the whole profession ought to move in that direction. This is upgrading the sport, and I'm all for it.

D. WETTERSTEN, KANSAS: I have two questions. The first is on endangered species -- wolves, alligators, etc. -- what form of legislation is needed? The other question in my mind is, what are we going to operate with? What determines whether, or to what degree, a species is endangered? Do you see a way of closer liaison with the States -- closer funding, etc. -- in identifying these creatures before they are "in the book?"

V. SCHMIDT: I think the water is muddled somewhat by the historical aspect. Certainly both the States (to the tune of somewhat over a million dollars) and the Bureau have had ongoing programs in the field to deal with endangered species. Then along came this major Endangered Species Act, and the main effort we are making now is to come up with some comprehensive plans and recovery plans for the species. This cannot be done in a fragmented fashion; we must lay out a total plan and then sit down with the States and anyone else who is interested and see who is best equipped to take up what slice of the pie.

You alluded to a point that concerns me. Apparently, in the minds of many people, success in the endangered program is getting the species on the list. My thought is that success is taking them off the list. As I think you know, we are caught up in some emotionalism here, and we have to get down to the sound business of management. I realize that we have perhaps tarried too long in getting out our recovery plans, but bear with us -- this is a major effort, getting these recovery plans out and shifting the emphasis from the planning stage to the field where the job gets done. This is where we would be delighted to work with you. As you know, we've had some difficulty up here in Minnesota; it was unfortunate, but I don't think we should let that stand in the way of continuing to move in the direction we want to go.

B. HERBST, MINNESOTA: In light of cooperation, and the fact that we did sit down and jointly write a plan, are you going to bend off your position on that one? You realize what happened as a result of that.... Because of the standoff on the part of those who wanted complete protection and the position of the Bureau, timber wolves now have no protection whatsoever in Minnesota. Our plan was for complete sanctuary and the upgrading of the species for a game animal, with regulation of harvest. But with some folks feeling this was too much protection and others wanted them eliminated like fox, the result was that no bill passed and they have no protection.

V. SCHMIDT: I understand, and I regret that seriously. Unfortunately, from our standpoint the problem was more of one of a management problem internally in the Bureau.

D. WETTERSTEN, KANSAS: We have another situation in Kansas, where there is a conflict with the endangered species list. Our prairie chicken population is such that we have long seasons on both the greater and lesser chickens. Now, it looks real bad to have those things in the "red

book" that we're shooting. I think we're running into a built-in conflict here. These birds may be endangered, but not because of hunting.

SCHMIDT: As I understand those aspects of the bill that are under consideration now, there are two categories of endangerment -- one is "threatened with", and the other is "endangered." The former one would permit some form of management to take place.

E. FRANK, WISCONSIN: You mentioned cost-sharing and grants-in-aid in relation to endangered species. I wonder if thought has been given to arrangements of this nature in other forms of studies such as river basins, Corps, SCS, etc. It seems that the States are so often assigned the task of field work with no money with which to do it, and the Federal Government coordinating the project.

V. SCHMIDT: Yes, indeed. This was part of the plan. In fact, one of the examples used in the so-called Federal-State concept was in terms of river basin studies. I think you might find this set up in the minutes of the meeting that Lenzini, your Counsel for the International, sent out; I believe that copies went to all States. It goes something like this. Let's say a workload in a particular state in terms of river basin functions is six man years. I think the Bureau would negotiate something like this... if we put on two permanent people and the State puts on a permanent man or two, we'd be willing to cost share at perhaps a 50% level because of the other State people working on that program. These are the kind of things we would like to work out. In areas other than river basins, we've got our so-called cooperative services both on Indian reservations and military reservations. There are opportunities for closer liaison on research, refuges, fish hatcheries, and some of this is already under way. Several States have requested fish hatcheries of ours, and we've been able to effect a transfer to them one way or another.

PRES. STUART: Any other questions? Well, thank you, Vic. At this time we will recess until 1:30.

(r e c e s s)

PRES. STUART: Gentlemen, if you'd come in and find a seat, we will reconvene the afternoon session. At this time I will call on Dick Wettersten for an announcement.

D. WETTERSTEN, KANSAS: I want to announce that the resolutions committee, which I have chaired now for the past couple of hours, will meet immediately following adjournment of the afternoon session, in the State Room.

Anyone wishing to sit in on the resolutions committee sessions is welcome.

PRES. STUART: Thanks, Dick. Any other announcements while we're waiting for the projectionist to set up? If not I've got one comment. You know, I think we may have to take some action as a group. We have two States which are seldom represented at these Midwest meetings. Those States are Illinois and Indiana.

Now, we have Cliff Morrow from the Hunting and Conservation Department of the National Rifle Association, and he has a film which he will be showing. Of course, we are in hopes that it will give us some ammunition insofar as the anti-hunting movement that is afoot. Without more ado, I will call on Cliff Morrow.

C. MORROW, NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION: Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Midwestern Association of Fish and Game Commissioners. I see that the projector has just left, and the projectionist with it, and the film -- is there anyone here with a soft shoe act?

My remarks this afternoon, according to the program, are entitled "Ortega's Meditations on Hunting." As most of you know, Ortega was a Spanish philosopher who died in 1944. One of the best-known 20th Century philosophers, his "Meditations on Hunting" is a prelude to larger works. It is a small book in which he examines the reasons why men hunt. We were able to pick up the rights from this book and turn it into a movie, and that's what I hope to show you here this afternoon.

Please remember, in watching this film, that this is the first time it's been shown to anyone except to some official members of our "family", and I've seen it just once. It's a contact print, not a release print. Consequently it has some technical faults in it.

This is a film that is not aimed at your usual constituency. It is not aimed at the hunting or fishing club, or the hunters in North America. This, rather, examines on a philosophical level, hunting, and the purpose of it is quite simple. It's to be shown to groups who are neither opposed to nor favor hunting, and provide them with a rationale of hunting. We hope that, in a small way, it might provide some ammunition or some insulation from the attack we are undergoing from the anti-hunting groups.

Since I am stuck with some extra time, I will expound this theme just a little bit. I think that in many cases we do not view the anti-hunting element for exactly what it

is. I think we have two things underway. We have an anti-hunting movement -- and, mistake you not, it is a movement and it is anti-hunting. The objective is not the hunter at all; it is the sport of hunting. This movement is headed up by four major organizations who are putting forth a major propaganda effort in this field. Their main fields that they cultivate are the urban centers, and they're doing big business. One of them, less than three years old, brags a membership of about half a million people. (It has taken my organization over a hundred years to get to a little over a million members -- so they are making headway.) They feed on the other thing that you and I are directly connected with, and that is the growing anti-hunter sentiment.

We have, in part, built some of the fires of the anti-hunter sentiment ourselves, because we have connected the hunter with some of the anti-social aspects of vandalism, misuse of firearms and misuse of wildlife, and we have accepted it, and in some cases defended it, as part of the hunting scene. This is not true. There is an ethical approach to hunting, and we need to put more emphasis on that particular part and get away from the proposition of labeling this anti-social vandal, outlaw, poacher or whatever you want to call him, as having anything at all to do with hunting. We need to make a direct separation between the two. We haven't done this. We use terms like "slob hunter." When you stop and think of what you do to people who are not connected with hunting when you say "slob hunter," it comes out pretty clear. It's so very easy to reverse that one phrase, from "slob hunter" to saying that all hunters are slobs. This is not so, and this is not the thing we are trying to put across at all. So, we've got some built-in problems, and we've added a little fuel to the fires on our own.

These are some of the things we are going to have to overcome. I think that, in your own bailiwicks, there are some things you have to take some hard and fast looks at. Game laws need to be examined in the light of what they actually are. Now, in most jurisdictions, game laws are misdemeanors -- rightfully so, for most of them. When you have an individual who hunts or fishes without a license, this is really a misdemeanor; no big proposition. Or, the individual who, perhaps inadvertently, takes the wrong kind of duck or mistakenly shoots a hen pheasant -- this still falls in the misdemeanor class. But, there is a division. You take the individual, on the other hand, who goes out and jacklights a deer and sells it; this man has committed a grand theft. He's taken a piece of public

property of a value of perhaps whatever it cost you to put that deer in your state's larder. He's taken this animal, this amount of money, and appropriated it for his own use. He's a thief -- nothing more or nothing less -- and this should fall in this precise category. So, part of the problem is that we have been too conclusive in our regard for game laws -- too conclusive in the enforcement -- and entirely too much prestige is granted to the guy who outwits the game warden.

These are some of the problems that build up the fire and develop this increasing amount of anti-hunter sentiment. I would like to bear down on the difference between this and the organized anti-hunting movement.

On the other hand, the anti-hunting movement is a well-financed, well-directed, well-charted movement with a blueprint they even have the courage to publish. This tells you, step by step, what their intent is: first, to pick at the weak parts of the hunting activities, and eliminate the weakest portion of it from Federal lands -- then all public lands, and finally all lands. Their first method of attack is the leg hold trap. As you will look at the amount of propaganda that is going out now in the form of newspaper advertisements, fliers and so forth from the various organizations, it's astounding the amount of money they are spending on this to generate more money to get back into the same propaganda mill. After leg hold traps, the next target is archery -- archery deer hunting, followed by primitive weapons, followed by dog and shotgun hunting (particularly of deer in the South), then by all shotgun hunting of big game, and then finally all hunting. But, it all ends up in the same place and in the same way. Perhaps the most disheartening thing about the whole proposition is that they are very successful in the amount of money that they are raising. They're moving along, and really bringing it in. And 90% of the money that is raised in these organizations goes right back into salaries, development of more propaganda, and appearances before your game commissions, your game hearings and your game legislative hearings, both on the State and Congressional levels. I understand that some of you now are faced in your regular game hearings with people representing these various organizations. There are four of them that are moving the strongest in this area. These are "Friends of Animals," a New York-based organization; the "Committee for Humane Legislation," which is based in Washington and is a maverick group that broke from the American Humane Association about ten or fifteen years ago -- they've just recently gotten into the anti-hunting field,

and since that time their income has gone up and their success has been much higher; the latest organization is "Funds For Animals," the president of which is Cleveland Amory and the executive vice president Louis Fregenstein. This last organization is the most astute in making the greatest inroads; they now claim a membership of about a half million people. They are employing field directors, and appearing before State legislatures and before game hearings.

That is just a quick rundown on the organizations that are on the other side. I see that we have the projector back, and the projectionist looks calm, collected, and thoroughly confident that this thing is going to show.

When the film is over I would like to come back to the podium, if I may, and discuss this thing a little bit. Frankly, having seen it only once and maybe being a little close to it, my emotions are a little mixed. I don't know whether it is good or bad, whether it misses or whether it doesn't. Please bear in mind that this is not a film to be shown to fish and game clubs or this particular level of people; this is a film to be shown to a neutral audience. The aim is not to convince anybody that hunting is the greatest sport on the face of the earth; it's not defensive; it's merely to say that hunting is an acceptable use of the wildlife resource, so why not use it? Let's see what we come up with...

(movie was shown)

C. MORROW: Well, there it is. Anybody have any comments?

(BOB ??): I think it's generally good, but I think the caustic remarks in a broad way about the news media and TV executive are not good. This could react in an adverse way. In essence we are guilty of doing the same as an anti-hunter who condemns all hunters for what the minority is doing.

C. MORROW: Okay. This is the kind of thing that I like to get out of this. There are some things that sort of get to me, too. I'm really not too happy with the man who does the narration -- in my own view, I would like to have seen more of a contemporary individual than that particular one. How about the crow sequence -- where a crow is shot? Anyone find that particularly distasteful?

C. HARRIS, MICHIGAN: A colleague has found that the actual hitting of the game with the shot is preferable to dwelling on the possibility.

M. PETOSKEY, MICHIGAN: Watching the kill may be distasteful to most people, but I personally did not find it so because of the explanation given.

B. ROSETTE, COLORADO: The scene on spraying the field might tend to alienate the farm community. Other than that, I think the film would be acceptable to a rural group.

B. HERBST, MINNESOTA: The film might better cover the important aspect that hunting in itself does not disturb game populations.

C. MORROW: Yes, we recognize this. Be assured that this is not the final or full treatment of the film. Incidentally, Kentucky has an outstanding film along this line, as do several other States.

W. BARBEE, NEBRASKA: My suggestion is that the logical sequence of reducing game to possession for food be shown. For example, if the hunter were shown carrying the rabbit and then sitting down to eat the meal with his family, it would complete the process.

D. JOHNSTON, ONTARIO: Perhaps the references to "American" hunters should be deleted, as this is usually thought of as "U.S." hunters. The film would have more international significance if Canadian hunters were included.

C. MORROW: I'd never considered that Canadians weren't Americans! This is true, and it's a good point.

M. PETOSKEY, MICHIGAN: I was particularly interested in your comment that the film should not be used without the proper introductory remarks being made. Why do you say this?

C. MORROW: Well, this is a carry-over from back when I was a service training officer, when we had a "thing" about the use of films -- that a film is no substitute for any portion of training, but just an aid. In order to do a good job with a film, first you've got to introduce it and tell the audience what they are going to see and what to look for. Then, after the film, you'd better go back and and re-emphasize the particular points, recalling them to your audience. Without this type of presentation, you run a good chance of not getting your message across at all. People see different things in a film, depending on their own individual moods -- some will sleep through it; some will dislike the whole film because of one sequence.

W. BARBEE, NEBRASKA: I was wondering about the use of this type of film on educational television. It would be difficult to use this type of approach on television, as the attention of the audience would be impossible to hold before and after the film.

C. MORROW: This is true. For television, what probably

would have to be done is to chop it into segments with the commentator in between, give it a whole new introduction and so forth. I'm not sure; I'm not that professional. There is no doubt that it needs work for its intended, non-TV use, too. It needs shortening -- some parts drag, especially the drawings. The whole pace should be quicker. I think that, with some work -- maybe cutting in some segments from your own state, having panel discussions, etc. -- you could make an excellent production out of it for educational television use.

PRES. STUART: Thank you, Cliff. We thoroughly appreciated that.

The next part of the program, I'm sure, is going to be of extreme interest to all in game management. Over the years we have had many discussions at the North American and the International, and the Midwest, on all-terrain vehicles and the problems that are inherent in this type of equipment. We asked Bob Hoover of the Colorado Division of Wildlife to make the presentation on the off-road vehicle problems on Federal lands. You are aware of the fact, of course, that the Forest Service is contemplating adopting some rules and regulations regarding this. I believe the Corps of Engineers is also considering it. There are several States that are having off-road vehicle hunting laws now, and I think this is very appropriate.

B. HOOVER, COLORADO: Thank you, President Stuart. Members of the Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Commissioners, and guests, it is a real pleasure to be here today and talk about the off-road vehicle problem on public lands. I note that I am supposed to be addressing myself to Federal lands, but I am taking all public lands and treating them as one.

Protection of public land resources from damage by off-road recreational vehicles is a problem of increasing magnitude, and one that public land administering agencies are ill equipped to cope with.

Sales of recreational vehicles of all types are booming, and buyers of these vehicles seem to have more and more time available to use these vehicles. Because most private landowners will not tolerate these vehicles running over their lands, vehicle operators are turning to the public lands for their recreation.

Land administering agencies, both Federal and State, have been overwhelmed with the problems of off-road vehicular users. In most cases, effective laws and regulations necessary to insure safe operation of these vehicles, to

protect or minimize the damage to natural resources, and to preserve human tranquility, do not exist. And, where they do exist, enforcement is inadequate due to a lack of manpower for enforcement or enforcement authority doesn't exist.

Hopefully, newly proposed laws and regulations on off-road vehicle use and the providing of law enforcement authority to all land-use agencies will help to correct the situation. There still remains, however, the problem of inadequate funds for employment of enforcement personnel. Meanwhile, damage to public lands from off-road vehicles continues to proliferate.

General Problems:

Problems associated with off-road vehicles fall into three general categories: (1) damage to improvements; (2) damage to natural resources; and (3) conflicts with other users of public lands.

Let's examine some of these. Damage to personal and public property may be accidental or intentional. Damage to fences, signs and campground facilities are the most common complaints. Littering, vandalism and larceny are also serious problems. Vandalism to and larceny from summer homes situated on or near public lands is a new problem that came with the snowmobile. Prior to the invention of snow machines, deep snows protected these summer homes from unwanted winter visitors.

As resource people, damage to natural resources is a major concern. Damage to and destruction of vegetation, soil compaction and erosion common result from off-road vehicular use. Such damage lowers the carrying capacity of public lands for fish and wildlife. Actual disturbance of wildlife is still another problem. Off-road vehicle users, intentionally or unintentionally, molest wildlife. Such molestation may weaken, kill or displace these animals from their traditional haunts.

Conflicts with other public land users, including other recreational users, is still another problem associated with off-road vehicular use. Motor bike users, for example, often disturb and endanger other trail users on foot or horseback. Snowmobilers and cross-country skiers are often incompatible. Range livestock, which are spooky by nature, are often driven away from watering places and good forage areas by motor vehicles. Many public land users who wouldn't object to the presence of off-road vehicles find the noise produced by these vehicles exceedingly offensive. I just learned

the other day of a new organization in Colorado called "MAN." And the letters MAN stand for Motorcyclists Against Noise. Apparently the noise is getting so bad that even the motorcyclists can't stand it.

Let's look at some specific problems. In Michigan, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife found the use of off-road vehicles on State wildlife management areas acquired with Federal Aid funds was degrading the wildlife habitat and, therefore, constituted a "diversion of funds." The Michigan Department of Natural Resources responded by closing these areas to off-road vehicle use.

A 33,000-acre unit managed by the Bureau of Land Management near Folsom, California, was opened to public use by the construction of an access road across private land. As soon as these areas were opened, as many as 500 motorcyclists would invade the area on a single weekend. Severe damage to the soil and vegetation and conflicts with livestock and wildlife soon became evident. Some cattle fled the area and were found as many as 15 miles away. The BLM tried unsuccessfully to restrict the cyclists to a 1,300-acre area. In desperation, the BLM closed the entire management unit to all uses except grazing.

In another example, the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission was successful in re-establishing elk on BLM lands in the Red Desert by a trapping and transplanting program. A number of elk were harvested annually from this area on a limited permit basis. Between the time the permits were issued in 1971 and the opening of the hunting season, a rally of off-road vehicle users from several states ran this elk herd completely out of the country. Hunting permits for this area had to be re-allocated to other areas. The BLM subsequently zoned this area against off-road vehicle use, and the elk herd is again reaching huntable numbers.

A 12-square-mile area of national forest on Pinon Mesa in Colorado is completely surrounded by private land and is accessible by one major road. For many years, Pinon Mesa supported an elk herd of 300 animals. Eighty percent of these animals calved and summered, and were available for the fall hunting season, on this isolated tract of public land. Because of excessive off-road vehicle disturbance, only 50 percent of the elk were using the area three years ago. This year, the local wildlife conservation officer has found very few elk in the area and has petitioned the U.S. Forest Service to limit vehicle use to the one major road passing through the area. Blue grouse have also nearly

disappeared here. It should be pointed out that none of the private landowners surrounding the national forest unit allow free public hunting.

I just learned the other day that elk in southern Idaho are running from the noise produced by snow machines, not even seeing the machines. Inevitably these animals go uphill in the deep snow, flounder, and some of them die of shock.

I could describe additional instances of conflicts between off-road motor vehicles and other public land uses, but these should suffice.

With all the problems associated with off-road vehicular use on public lands, one might ask if there is a place for off-road vehicles on the public lands.

The U. S. Department of the Interior Task Force on Off-Road Recreation Vehicles and Secretary of the Interior Rogers Morton, back in 1971, both recognized that off-road vehicle use is one of many legitimate uses of public lands. At the same time, they expressed concern over environmental damage and said such use would have to be controlled, including exclusion of use from some areas.

In its report to President Nixon, the Public Land Law Review Commission included a recommendation which read: "Recreation use should be regulated to minimize conflicts with natural conditions and with other uses of public lands."

Subsequently, on February 8, 1972, President Nixon issued Executive Order 11644 relative to the use of off-road vehicles on public lands. In this order, the President recognized that problems with off-road vehicles existed, and ordered the establishment of policies and procedures which would "ensure use of off-road vehicles on public lands will be controlled and directed so as to protect the resources of those lands...and to minimize conflicts among the various uses of those lands." The President ordered each agency to develop and issue regulations and to provide for administrative designation of the specific areas and tract on public lands on which the use of off-road vehicles could be permitted, or not permitted. He further stated that such regulations should take into consideration the minimization of damage to soil, watershed vegetation, wildlife and wildlife habitat.

Pursuant to the President's Executive Order the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the National Park Service and the Forest Service proposed regulations in the Federal Register.

The Off-Road Vehicle Committee of the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners reviewed these proposed regulations and sent comments thereon to persons in charge of all these agencies except for BSWF. Two areas of major concern expressed in the Committee's comments were the lack of uniformity among the Federal agencies and the exemption from the regulations when prospecting for minerals. This exemption could completely nullify the regulations, in that anyone carrying any prospecting tools or instruments -- such as a geiger counter or even a pick and shovel -- could be exempt from the regulations.

On the State scene, as mentioned by your president, a number of States have enacted laws controlling the use of off-road vehicles. There has been no effort until this year to develop a uniform vehicle code. Now, the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Laws and Ordinances has undertaken the responsibility of drafting a model state law for regulating off-highway traffic. A draft of this proposed law, identified as Draft No. 2 and dated March 1st, was prepared by the staff of the National Committee.

Draft No. 2 was exposed to a panel of specialists for review and revision in Washington, D.C. in April of 1973. Panelists included representatives of off-road vehicle manufacturing associations, State law enforcement, motor vehicle and wildlife agencies, and the National Safety Council. Prior to this meeting, Harry R. Woodward, the State wildlife panelist, distributed copies of the draft and solicited comments from the Off-Road Vehicle and Public Lands Committee of the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners, the Land Resources Committee of the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners, and several State wildlife agencies not represented on these committees. Because of other urgent business, Woodward sent me to represent him on the panel.

Decisions on revising this draft was based on a vote of panel members. Therefore, recommendations of wildlife interests didn't always prevail. Furthermore, some of these recommendations were found to be inappropriate when I got to Washington, because it was learned that the model law is intended to cover shopping center parking lots and similar areas as well as cross-country areas and trails.

The purpose of this proposed law is to promote the protection of persons, property and the environment by providing reasonable regulations covering the operation of most motor vehicles at many off-highway locations. The proposed law makes rules of the road applicable to off-highway situations.

It imposes driver licensing requirements, and registration and vehicle numbering requirements. It limits the use of off-road vehicles on public highways. It imposes certain minimal requirements to insure that vehicles operated in public places are visible, are capable of being stopped, and will not cause unreasonable levels of noise or air pollution.

I will now present a cursory analysis on the proposed law, with special emphasis on those portions which I consider inadequate, a source of conflict, or otherwise deficient insofar as wildlife and the environment are concerned or worthy of special mention.

The Definitions section caused the biggest problem. When we found that this was the big handup, we passed over it and hoped to get back to it in the two days we had. Unfortunately, we never did get back to the Definitions section.

Let's examine some of these definitions. The definition of "highway" as being "the entire width between the boundary lines of every way publicly maintained...", while adequate for many eastern states where the road right-of-way is fenced, is grossly inadequate in many portions of the west where roads pass through open ranges.

The definition of "off-highway vehicle" was the most controversial one discussed by the panel, and this is the one we really got hung up on. Contributing to the problem is the fact that the definition was written to define off-highway vehicles for only two purposes -- (1) to determine which vehicles should be separately registered as off-highway vehicles; and (2) to describe those vehicles which could not be used on highways except under very limited circumstances. Thus, since the definition of off-highway vehicles isn't intended to be a literal definition, 4-wheel drive vehicles, cycles and dune buggies which can be used both on and off highways are excluded from the definition.

In the definition of "vehicle," the capabilities for travel over land and frozen water is used. The intent here is to exclude boats and floating devices used on water in a liquid state. However, this definition excluded amphibious vehicles and hovercraft when used in aquatic situations. Since vehicles so used may be extremely harmful to nesting waterfowl and waterfowl habitat, we should attempt to get this definition changed.

The registering authority for off-highway vehicles is only described as the "Department," which is defined in the Definition section as the "appropriate state agency." While many people in State administration are of the opinion that State

motor vehicle departments are in the best position to handle all vehicle registrations, some still maintain that the State conservation or recreation agency should handle registration of off-highway vehicles. The proposed law leaves this determination up to each State.

A very important provision under the Registration section says the "department may impose reasonable restrictions on their (vehicle) use that may be necessary for safe operation, preservation of the environment or for the tranquility of the citizens...". This provision is most appropriate, but raises an important question on successful implementation. For example, if the State adopts this code and appoints the State motor vehicle department as the administering agency for off-highway vehicles, will this agency have the necessary expertise or interest to promulgate regulations to protect the environment, including wildlife? In this connection, it should be noted that this provision in the proposed law is permissive rather than mandatory. Perhaps we should recommend that this provision be made mandatory and that such regulations be promulgated with the cooperation of other appropriate State agencies, including but not limited to those having authority over natural resources and environmental protection.

The licensing section makes an appropriate license mandatory for the operator of each type or class of off-road vehicle, and provides for an examination of applicants. Enactment of such provision could impose some serious administrative problems for those States not set up to examine applicants for such licenses. This section may also cause some problems in that no provision is made for an unlicensed nonresident who may visit in another state. The law proposed by the Upper Great Lakes Commission, of which some of you are members, takes care of this by providing a short term license for nonresidents. It should be mentioned, however, that no attempt is made in the proposed law we are analyzing to specify the types of licenses or the minimum qualifications therefor. Such matters remain discretionary with the individual States.

A requirement for obtaining permission is contained in Section 5(a) of the proposed law. Some States may wish to substitute their existing criminal trespass law here, to avoid conflict with existing laws. This section also requires "express or reasonably implied permission" to operate on public lands. The Off-Road Vehicle Committee of the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners is of the opinion that all public lands should be open to vehicular use unless such use is prohibited by zoning and/or

posting. This same section also contains a worthwhile prohibition against littering or the operation of a vehicle so as "to cause unnecessary damage to the land or any structures thereon, or to any natural or cultivated vegetation." A shortcoming of this subsection is that littering and damage shall not be caused "without permission of the landowner." This implies that this restriction concerns only private land; we should insist that this be changed to include all lands.

Section 13 is of the greatest concern to State wildlife agencies, in that it concerns protection of animals. Subsections (a) and (c) were completely rewritten by me, and an explanatory note was provided on subsection (b) with the permission of other panel members. Some of my recommended changes were incorporated in the final draft, while others were not. Because of the importance of this section, I will discuss each subsection.

Subsection 13(a) prohibits the use of motor vehicles to molest, injure or kill wild or domestic animals or birds except as otherwise provided in subsection 13(c). This subsection was changed as recommended except for not transferring an exemption for livestock owners and their agents to the exclusion subsection.

Subsection (b), however, some of you will not like. It requires all firearms and bows carried on or in motor vehicles to be unloaded or unstrung and securely enclosed in a case except for law enforcement officers. This is not just for off-road vehicles; this is all vehicles. The broad application of this subsection to all motor vehicles and the requirement that all weapons be securely enclosed in a case is too restrictive and would be unacceptable in most western states where ranchers depend upon readily accessible firearms for shooting predators, stray dogs and cats, etc. Relative to this subject, the Alaska Fish and Game Department said that there are still portions of Alaska where it is foolhardy to be without a loaded weapon. Rather than change this subsection to meet the needs of all States, I suggested leaving it as stated in Draft No. 2 but including an explanatory note following this section and making provisions for exceptions in subsection 13(c). The Committee did include the explanatory note in the final draft, which suggested that States may wish to replace subsection 13(b) with the appropriate portion of their game code dealing with transportation of weapons in or on vehicles.

Subsection 13(c) includes exemptions from the provisions of the two other subsections. Exempted are: (1) official activities of agents of State wildlife agencies, and activities

of any other person authorized under a permit issued by the State wildlife agency; and (2) official activities of agents of any Federal agency or activities of any person authorized under a permit issued by the Federal agency, but only with respect to activities on lands which are under the jurisdiction of that Federal agency. In rewriting this subsection, the staff of the Committee partially complied with my recommendations but introduced some serious errors. First of all, there is the error of not including in this subsection livestock owners and their agents when directly engaged in activities related to husbandry of domestic animals. In other words, if a rancher goes out to take some feed to his livestock on snowmobile trailers, he shouldn't have the problem of the law restricting his being out there with the animals. An even graver error is that introduced by authorizing Federal agencies to issue permits exempting persons from the prohibitions in subsections 13(a) and 13(b). Except for migratory birds and other species covered by International Treaty, issuance of permits for molesting or taking of resident wildlife constitutes an infringement on States' Rights which cannot be tolerated. In my recommendation to the Committee, I suggested that only employees of Federal wildlife agencies be exempted.

Section 16 provides for the issuance of special permits by State or local authorities to exempt persons from the provisions of the proposed law. Issuance of such permits is permissive and allows the issuing authority to specify reasonable conditions and restrictions for public safety or to facilitate the flow of traffic. Other justifications for imposing conditions which were not included should be for the protection of the environment and restoration of any damage resulting from activities pursuant to the permit.

Section 20 properly includes State conservation officers among those authorized to enforce the provisions of the proposed law.

Section 21 makes violations of the proposed law a misdemeanor and subject to penalties of the vehicle code. The problem here is that penalties in the State vehicle code may be less severe than those provided under related statutes contained in the State's wildlife or environmental protection codes. Reference should be made in the model code to more severe penalties if such penalties do exist elsewhere in a State's statutes.

The final draft of the proposed model law for regulating off-highway traffic has been printed and sent to the Committee on Suggested State Legislation of the Council of State Governments. This Committee was to review the draft at its

annual meeting in Seattle, Washington, June 21 and 22. The draft must then have the approval of the Council of State Governments before being distributed to the States.

Since the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners is the only such association known to have an Off-Road Vehicle Committee, I suggested that this Committee take the initiative in preparing a detailed list of recommendations for correcting and improving the proposed law. Once this list has been prepared and approved by the Western Association, it should be submitted to the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners for concurrence. Eventually, every State legislative body should receive a copy of our comments, either as an addendum to the report of the Council of State Governments or by direct mailing.

Your suggestions relative to my comments of the revision of the proposed law and the course of action I have recommended will be appreciated.

As for a solution to the off-road vehicle problem, I recommend a two-pronged attack. An educational program similar to those of many States in connection with hunter safety education would certainly be beneficial. The other prong of the attack must be controls on off-road vehicle use by regulations and/or laws which would include some provisions for zoning of vehicular use. Obviously, any controls imposed must be backed up with rigid law enforcement. When we mention enactment of laws or enforcement of laws, it raises the question of responsibility. Under the police powers granted to the States by the Constitution, the State and not the Federal government should have the primary responsibility or authority over vehicle control. The Federal agencies, of course, should have some control on their respective properties.

In conclusion, let me repeat my earlier solicitation of comments from those States represented here today, on the proposed model law and the course of action I have recommended. Let's come up with something we can live with and, above all, something that will protect the resources for which we are responsible for managing.

PRES. STUART: Thank you, Bob. I'm sure there are some comments or questions....

C. THREINEN, WISCONSIN: The section on signing might offer a bit of a problem. If, for example, you have a law stating that an area is open unless posted as closed, the posting signs get torn down. On the other hand, if the law says the area is closed unless posted as open, there are

problems in getting it across to the people and also in enforcement.

B. HOOVER: I wonder if I misstated that. The Western Committee recommended it should be open unless posted as closed. We figured we would end up with a bunch of sign pollution, otherwise.

C. HARRIS, MICHIGAN: We were recently in the throes of the same situation, adopting an off-road wheeled vehicle restriction on State-owned areas. The law originally read that all lands were closed to off-road vehicle use except those areas opened by posting. We took such a beating on this, in public hearings, that the action was changed. Consequently, with the reversed situation of the land being open for off-road vehicles unless posted as closed, the signs are being torn down at an alarming rate -- a sign put up on Monday might have to be replaced the following Monday. I feel that eventually we will have to return to the route of the lands being closed unless posted as open. However, our law enforcement people tell me that in that case we will have to post it both ways -- the closed areas as closed and the open areas as open -- otherwise, cases cannot be made in court.

B. HOOVER: This does seem to be the big problem. I know that the Federal agencies do not agree on the proper procedure to be followed.

M. PETOSKEY, MICHIGAN: The action in Michigan actually came about as a result of horseback riding, not particularly because of the off-road vehicle use.

B. HOOVER: My source of information was the Wildlife Management Institute newsletter, and it indicated off-road vehicles as well as horseback. Again, it was conflict of use.

In addition to a concentrated effort in enforcement of restriction regulations, we are going to have to have an educational attack on this one problem. If people realize that they are going to have to behave themselves, it would be to the benefit of everybody. I think then we might get some compliance.

C. HARRIS, MICHIGAN: In our case we held a public hearing on the problem, and invited comments and solutions from the general public as well as representatives of manufacturers of off-trail vehicles such as snowmobiles. I think we have got to start with the industry, to get their cooperation in the education of their customers. Without their efforts along this line, we're not getting anywhere.

B. HOOVER: The snowmobile manufacturers association and the motorcycle manufacturers association were represented on this panel, and they were really upset when we started talking about licensing and registration. They didn't want any part of it, and emphasized the family activity -- you know, Junior with his little minibike, and on up -- they really made a big play on that family activity thing.

B. ROSETTE, COLORADO: I want to make the point that when we speak of enforcement, this should include enforcement by county sheriffs, municipal police, and so on.

L. GRINDE, NORTH DAKOTA: One of the biggest problems in enforcement of off-road vehicle restrictions -- speaking particularly of snowmobiles -- is vehicle identification. Some method such as that proposal of having an identification number on the snowmobile track would be great, if it worked.

B. HOOVER: Most certainly, we are going to need all the help we can get if we are going to have any kind of enforcement of these off-the-road vehicles. There are just not that many of us.

B. HERBST, MINNESOTA: About this idea of having the number stamped on the snowmobile track -- Minnesota did some experimentation on this, without success. We have now closed all our State parks and management areas to the use of off-road vehicles, with the exception of those trails that are designated as open to this use.

M. PETOSKEY, MICHIGAN: Do you have a minimum age for operating them?

B. HERBST: Yes -- fourteen, unless a safety course is taken and passed.

B. HOOVER: I've probably burdened you too much already on this, but the model law makes a provision that a youngster can get a license provided they completed a satisfactory course showing they are proficient in the operating of the vehicle. This would be up to the individual States. It's in the code.

You people in the Great Lakes States experienced this snowmobile situation much longer than we have, and we look to you for leadership on this.

B. HERBST: The biggest problem we have in Minnesota is the safety factor. Just last year, 33 were killed in snowmobile accidents, with 12,000 hospitalized.

B. HOOVER: Several of our own employees have reported injuries -- how many unreported, we don't know. One was seriously hurt.

PRES. STUART: Bob, what's the Western States' attitude toward the 4-wheel drive vehicle -- for instance, the 4 WD pickup, the Blazer, etc. -- this type of off-road vehicle?

B. HOOVER: I don't know if the Western has taken an official position on this, but I can tell you from experience that we have four large blocks of public land on which -- if we couldn't allow cross-country 4-wheel-drive travel to get to the interior of the land -- we wouldn't get a harvest. I am speaking primarily of BLM land, which has antelope hunting, sage grouse hunting, and so forth.

PRES. STUART: If there are no further questions, we will recess for coffee and will have drawings for a few more door prizes right after that.

(drawings...)

PRES. STUART: The next speaker on the program does not need any introduction whatsoever. He's Keith Harmon, who worked in North Dakota for years as Extension Wildlife Specialist. He is now with the Wildlife Management Institute, serving about ten States in the Mid-Continent. He is an authority on USDA and USDA programs. Keith Harmon.

K. HARMON, WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE: Thanks, Russ. I appreciate being an authority, but I'm not really sure there are too many authorities on many USDA programs. After some of our discussions in the recent past, I am not too sure there are too many in the USDA. I think that many of them really don't understand a lot of things that are going on in this thing, or the problems connected with it. It is a little difficult for me to give you a status report on the Set-Aside Program. I promised Russ that I would have a paper over to him during the middle of last week, but the Farm Bill was before the full House starting last Tuesday and I thought I would wait until they finalized that. Unfortunately, they are still debating the Farm Bill on the House floor today. It was really difficult to finalize this thing into any real definite form.

I do appreciate the opportunity to spend a little time with you, and try to bring you up to date, basically, on the set-aside provision that exists within the authority of the pending 1973 Farm Bill. I emphasize the point pending, because it is changing almost daily at the present time. Before getting into any real specifics, I would like to review some of the past activities that have brought us up to this point in time. To some of you, this will be plowing old ground. Some of the information has been presented at the International Association meeting held in conjunction with the North American in both Mexico City and Washington. Also,

Maynard Nelson and I presented a paper on this subject at the annual meeting of the International held in Hot Springs, Arkansas, last year. As many of you will recall, there was some rather brief discussions of this activity at the Wichita meeting last year. Since that time, quite a bit has been done. When we talked before, this thing was in a process of gathering momentum; now, some of these things are starting to jell.

In 1971, a rather loosely knit group of biologists from North and South Dakota, Minnesota, the South Dakota State University, the Institute, and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife met in Brookings, South Dakota. The idea of this meeting was a kind of brainstorm session, to try to identify some of the problems and possible solutions that were connected to farm game, and more specifically to a USDA agricultural program. As a result of this meeting in 1971, we formed what is presently known as the Farm Programs Committee. One of the things we concluded at that meeting was that, in order to get a handle on this thing, it would be necessary to go ahead and spot check cover conditions on set-aside land in at least those three states, to try to find out exactly what was going on.

Even though we suspected that the result of this survey would merely document what was already known, the need for sound basic data and some sound perspective was really obvious. Time was quite critical, as new farm legislation would be coming before Congress within about a year and a half. There was little doubt that, if we were going to have an opportunity to make any constructive changes, we were going to have to have this data in addition to having the support of quite a large geographical area.

Following the surveys that were done in the two Dakotas and Minnesota in 1971, a decision was made to expand the Farm Programs Committee to include another ten States -- these were Colorado, Illinois, Iowa, Indiana, Kansas, Michigan, Nebraska, Ohio, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin. So the 3-State committee was expanded to a 13-State committee which contained about 55 percent of the Nation's cropland and about the same percentage of retired feed grain and wheat acreage.

As a result of personal letters to directors and a number of phone calls, each of you quite generously authorized a representative from your State, and the first 13-State Committee meeting was held in St. Paul, on February 3, 1972. I don't know how it happened, but Maynard Nelson and I were given the honor -- or railroaded, however you want to look at it -- of being co-chairmen of this Farm Programs Committee. At this time we would like to express our appreciation to the

directors for the participation of these representatives on the Farm Programs Committee. Little could have been accomplished without this coordinated approach.

As a result of our St. Paul meeting, all 13 States participated in a survey of set-aside acres in June, July, and November or December of last year - depending on when the individual State had the major activities during hunting seasons. The field biologists of the individual States checked about 121,000 acres on 3,543 farms to determine the cover conditions on the land retired. In other words, we were trying to obtain good, sound data to launch what we anticipated to be a rather intensive effort to make changes in new farm legislation due in 1973. The individual State data were then sent to the Minnesota Madelia Research Center for evaluation and summarization by one of their upland game statisticians.

Essentially, we found that land set-aside in 1972 yielded extremely limited benefits for either wildlife or soil erosion control. The June survey showed that 57 percent of the land retired in all the 13 states was absolutely bare of any cover at all. By the time the November-December survey was conducted, 85 percent of all the land set aside in all these states contained absolutely no cover. So, you could say that about 15 million acres of land in these 13 states had no cover for twelve months out of the year, and 85 percent of the 30 million retired acres had absolutely no cover for approximately 8 or 9 months of the year. We are of the opinion that no programs using public funds can ever be justified for this kind of resource destruction, at least in terms of soil resource. Wildlife is just a by-product of that.

The Farm Programs Committee has made good use of this information. Following is a capsulized summary of what has taken place since the inception of the Committee...

- (1) At least 25 letters have been written to USDA officials regarding the management of set-aside lands.
- (2) At least 71 letters have been sent to members of Congress pointing out the need for changes in the new agricultural program.
- (3) Two rather formal papers have been presented - one at the International's annual meeting, and an even more technical paper at the Midwest Fish and Wildlife Conference. These papers were included in the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee record and the House Committee on Agriculture's files.

(4) Two articles have been published on land retirement in the new Wildlife Society bulletin.

(5) At least 18 formal resolutions have been passed supporting the concept of cover on set-aside acres. A couple rather significant ones were the resolution passed by the Minnesota Association of Soil Conservation Districts and the similar one passed by the North Dakota Association of Soil Conservation Districts. The North Dakota Committee on Soil and Water Conservation also passed a position statement indicating the need for this type of management of retired land. Those resolutions received prior to the Congressional hearings were introduced as testimony. Frankly, this has been a rather weak area -- we've stressed many times to Committee members to get out and talk to farm groups and get as many of these resolutions passed as possible. This effort was not as successful as it probably should have been.

(6) About six months ago, the Farm Programs Committee joined forces with what is known as the Farm Game Committee, which represents 16 Southeastern States. So, we now have basically about 29 States working toward a mutual interest, represented by the two committees.

(7) As many of you are aware, the cartoon publication "The Rise, Fall and Future of the Ringneck Pheasant," was published by the Wildlife Management Institute. To date, over 20,000 copies have been distributed to the States at cost.

(8) Maynard Nelson and I, again as co-chairmen of the Committee, and Chester McConnell who is chairman of the southeastern Farm Game Committee, have been involved in a number of activities on behalf of our respective committees. Each of the three of us testified before both the House and Senate Agriculture committees' hearings on new farm legislation. We also had occasion to present set-aside background data and our recommended changes at a Congressional breakfast held in Washington, D.C., with five Congressmen and 40-some aides in attendance. Hopefully, we made a little progress with this last effort. We provided background information and left material for at least fourteen key Congressmen, including a personal meeting with House Agricultural Committee Chairman Poage. We provided information in personal meetings with the Senate Legal Council and staff members of the House and Senate Agricultural Com-

mittees. Dr. Larry Jahn provided technical assistance on Senator Humphrey's amendment to S.1888, the Senate Farm Program, and Larry Jahn and Chester McConnell provided technical assistance on Title X (Rural Conservation) of H.R. 8860, the House Farm Bill -- these were at the request of the staffs of the respective Senate and House Agricultural Committees.

(9) Comments were filed on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement written by A.S.C.S. for the 1972 Set-Aside Program. (We don't know how much effect this had, because the Impact Statement was put out for circulation three days after the program went into effect.) Six of the States filed adverse comments, while about 17 did not respond. In addition, the International, BSF&W, and WMI filed adverse statements. It seems important to note that a review of the comments attached to the Final Impact Statement shows a definite lack of response by game & fish agencies, nationwide. One State, for example -- I won't mention which one -- which had possibly in the neighborhood of a million acres of land retired, submitted the comment on the Impact Statement that if the Set Aside Program ever became operational in that state, they would like to comment on it. Frankly, there is no reason for this ever happening.

(10) Just recently, ASCS filed a Draft Environmental Statement on the new farm bill. To date, the only comments I am aware of are by the Wildlife Management Institute, the Wildlife Federation, and the States of Minnesota and Tennessee.

I didn't mean to drag this thing out, but I wanted to emphasize that these committees that represent a combined interest of a number of States can be a highly effective approach to problems -- probably the only type of approach that will work in the future.

Anyway, as a result of all the activities of the Farm Programs Committee -- on June 7 of this year, the full Senate passed S.1888, the Agricultural and Consumer Protection Act of 1973. The clean bill reported out by the Senate Committee contained no provisions for long-term land retirement, but Senator Humphrey and 13 co-sponsors introduced Section 818 as an amendment to the bill. The amendment, which was passed unanimously, contains the following provisions...

(1) the Secretary of Agriculture may enter into multi-year set-aside contracts for wheat, feed grains and cotton.

(2) Producers entering into multi-year set-aside contracts shall be required to devote these lands to a vegetative cover crop capable of maintaining itself throughout the contract period. This wording was put in there by design because some of the Southern States were not too anxious to see some of the particular types of crops or cover that might be planted. In many cases they would just as soon see the field come up with some type of volunteer cover.

(3) The Secretary of Agriculture shall appoint a six-man advisory board in each state to advise the State ASCS Committee. The members shall be qualified in soils, water, wildlife, fish and forestry. In other words, there would be some opportunity for these varying interests to meet with the ASCS Committee, at least as pertains to management over these multi-year contracts.

(5) The Secretary of Agriculture, through a National Advisory Board appointed in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, shall seek advice and assistance on technical aspects of wildlife habitat and carrying out programs of wildlife management on acreage set aside.

(6) The state director of wildlife resources (or comparable officer) shall be an ex officio member of the state ASCS Committee -- which means, technically, that he has no vote. But this would, we believe, establish a little closer contact between the varied interests.

Now, the House Agricultural Committee has taken a little different approach. That Committee reported H.R. 8860 out on June 20. As Title X (Rural Environmental Conservation) is contained in the bill, this eliminated the need for an amendment. The House bill contains the following features...

(1) The Secretary of Agriculture shall carry out the purposes of: Clauses 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 of Section 7A of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, which provides for technical and financial assistance for soil conservation; Section 16B of the Great Plains Act, providing cost-sharing conservation practices and shifts in land use in the Great Plains states; and the Water Bank Act. As I think you can see, they are trying to come in the back door on some of these programs that have taken it in the neck by impoundment of funds, and trying to reinstate those under this kind of approach. Those two programs, REAP and Water Bank, were terminated

in January of 1973 by, basically, impoundment of funds by the Administration. Incidentally, on June 15 the House passed H.R. 8619 which contains \$11.4 million for Water Bank and \$175 million for REAP. It hasn't come through the Senate as far as I know.

(2) In carrying out the provisions of REAP, Great Plains and Water Bank, the Secretary shall enter into contracts of 3, 5, 10 or 25 years. We would prefer to see those lower ends dropped, but the 10 and 25 year contracts might be quite significant.

(3) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to purchase perpetual easements for the sound use and management of flood plains, shore lands, and aquatic areas of the nation. I think in many cases where this authority is not known, particularly in channelization projects, this could be another tool.

(4) The Secretary may enter into multi-year set-aside contracts for a period not to extend beyond the 1977 crop year. This makes the House version a 4-year program, while the Senate bill provides for 5 years.

(5) No grazing is permitted on multi-year contracts. This wording is not in the Senate version, although we have been led to believe that grazing would be restricted by intent.

(6) The Secretary shall provide cost-sharing for the establishment of a cover capable of maintaining itself for the length of the contract period.

(7) The Secretary shall appoint an advisory board in each state to advise the State ASCS Committee. In this case the wording is that the members include, but not be limited to, the State soil conservationist, the State forester, the State administrator of water quality, and the State wildlife administrator.

(8) The Secretary would appoint a national advisory board to be named in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior.

In the House version it kind of ran into a roadblock, as far as getting the wildlife administrator in the State to become an ex officio member of the State ASCS Committee, but it didn't really seem to be a point that had to be pushed very hard.

Basically, this is where we stand right now. We believe our case has been well documented; no one really has disputed these figures -- in fact, nobody else has any figures. The decision-makers are well aware of our objectives. The Senate has passed

a farm bill with provisions that are favorable to our objectives, and similar provisions are also in the House bill which is now before the full House.

Debate began in the House on July 10. Apparently they have run into some problems as some of the coalitions that were supposedly formed between rural and urban interests have broken down, and on July 12 the House voted to suspend debate. The major area of disagreement appears to be the target price concept as provided in each bill. This is, basically, that as long as the demand stays high and prices stay high, correspondingly, there would be no price support payments by the Federal government. But as soon as wheat or feed grains drop below that target price - basically, about \$2.00 for wheat and \$1.35 for corn - you would then start paying price supports to farmers. The Administration at this time thinks this would be prohibitively costly; in fact, the Secretary of Agriculture even threatened an administrative veto if these provisions were left in.

The Administration is asking for the escalator clause of the target price feature to be eliminated and for a 3-year phase-out period to eliminate farm subsidies. The House has so far rejected the Administration's request. Congressman Poage, Chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, has been quoted as saying that a compromise might be a one or two year farm bill. We are concerned about this, as such a move might endanger multi-year contracts for the next few years. Keep in mind that the Senate has passed a 5-year program and the difference would have to be resolved in Conference Committee. Under an amendment introduced yesterday by Bergland of Minnesota, the cotton portion of the program seems to have been dropped. Also, there is increased authority given to the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate food prices.

So, it would appear that the Administration is not opposed to setting aside cropland or taking land out of production. However, at this point we don't know if they look favorably on multi-year contracts. In testimony before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, Secretary Butz said, "...we are not proposing to move agriculture to a totally free market. We propose to keep the set-aside authority." Although he did not mention multi-year contracts, he did say further on in his testimony that "unprotected set-aside acreages, particularly in areas where acreage lies fallow, have received substantial criticism because of the erosion hazards created and also because of the loss of nesting and feeding areas for wildlife." We think it is pretty significant that the Secretary of Agriculture said this; we seem to have gotten through to a few people, anyway.

Disregarding the politics of this thing, I think there is reason to believe that land will continue to be retired in the near future. Nobody can predict at what level. During the period 1949-50, 350 million acres were harvested. The acreage harvested in the period 1969-70 dropped to 300 million acres. Most agricultural economists have been saying that the acreage harvested in 1985 will still be about 300 million acres of land. So, from a very theoretical standpoint, the same amount of land should be retired in the year 1985 as at the present time, assuming a 2.2 percent increase per year in yields and the present rate of population increase.

So, the situation, at least to us, appears to be a need for land retirement and a desire on the part of the Administration and Congress to retain the set-aside authority. Congress, at least, has indicated the need for multi-year contracts with established cover -- which basically has been the Farm Program Committee's goal. However, the debate is still going on in the House over target prices, or what many call a guaranteed income for farmers, and this may be what determines the fate of wildlife cover on set-aside acres. There is nothing a person can really do at this point.

I think we can keep in mind that the Senate bill is a 5-year bill and the House bill would be a 2-year bill but it still has to go to Conference Committee and it could be raised upward there. This would be a time for the States to really pull the stops out when this thing hits in the Conference Committee, and to point out what they think are the best versions in those bills and which ones they support. It is essential that the States really get on top of this thing or we might lose the whole program. We will be advising the States as to the time to do this.

This, then, brings you up to date. Obviously, there are a number of unknowns, and much remains to be done. We of the Farm Programs Committee are quite proud of the progress we have made to date, and regardless of the outcome we will be proud of our efforts.

Thank you.

G. DELLINGER, MISSOURI: Where does the appropriation come in, on this program?

HARMON: Well, there is nothing in either the House or the Senate farm bill that handles the appropriation. This would have to go through the subcommittee for appropriations on agriculture -- the whole process. There's the appropriation, the Conference Committee, and then the regulations. Even though we have done a lot of work, we're only about a third of the way home.

T. KRAMER, CORPS OF ENGINEERS: I am wondering about the handling of perpetual easements. I'm sure there is a great deal of consideration being given to purchase in fee rather than taking easements, as the advantages are limited with easements.

HARMON: Well, there are two different things here. The provisions of the Water Bank, REAP and Great Plains programs say that contracts could be entered into for 3, 5, 10 or 25 years. Another, entirely different, provision is that the Secretary of Agriculture would have authority, in addition, to enter into perpetual easements for flood plains, shoreline and aquatic areas. I'm not sure how this easement program would be implemented, as there will have to be regulations published on this by the Secretary. But, basically, what we desire would be that, in a situation such as a massive channelization project where the agencies involved had no authority to stop environmental damage, the Secretary of Agriculture could come in and say, okay, for a certain price we will pay you for a perpetual easement. This would be, in effect, buying the rights to intensive cropping and instead converting to pasture. I'm speculating now, but these are some possibilities.

In deciding whether to go to fee title or perpetual easements, I think you would have to look at it on a case by case basis. I would be more inclined to fee title, but in many cases you get strong reactions within the states. North Dakota is a good example, as the people don't take too lightly to Federal acquisition of land. Also, in many cases, the Federal agency involved has no authority to buy land. The real test will come when they get down to writing the regulations. The Committee thinks the provision will be a real useful tool for the Department of Agriculture, as they now have virtually no authority in either of these areas - fee title or easement.

B. HERBST, MINNESOTA: I think this has been a tremendous effort on the part of this Committee. If we can get this section of the bill through, it will be a significant accomplishment in the areas of erosion control and habitat improvement. If I'm not out of line, I would like to move that the Midwest Association hereby express its sincere appreciation and thanks to the Co-Chairmen and members of the Committee, and urge their continued efforts in the task still ahead.

PRES. STUART: Bob, you are not out of line, and I will entertain your motion. Do I hear a second? Seconded by Les Voigt. Any discussion?...All those in favor signify by saying "aye." Opposed?...Motion carried unanimously.

Keith, thank you very much. On behalf of the Association I wish to express thanks to you and Maynard Nelson primarily for the tremendous amount of work you have done on this. I will also express disappointment in North Dakota and some of the other States because we have not given you more support in your efforts in Congress.

Let's move along. Many of you were working on regional task forces and national task forces just three or four years ago, with the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, in reviewing primarily the Action Report on Fish and Wildlife of the National Water Resources Program and attempting wherever possible to strengthen its provisions. Carl Noren of Missouri actually represented the Midwest Association on that. I think that many of the States had personnel at various meetings around the Midwest as well as in Washington, and this was discussed rather thoroughly at the joint meeting at Snowmass, Colorado, two years ago. I, for one, have wondered what has happened in the two-year period. We have Jerry Stegman with us today, to give us a report on the status of the Action Report.

JERRY STEGMAN, CHIEF, RIVER BASIN STUDIES: Thank you, Russ. I appreciate the opportunity to appear here today and give the status report. Actually, it is a partial status report on the so-called "Action Report" which I am sure all of you are familiar with. This is the version that was put out in September 1971. If I may generalize, the Action Report was a result of a national meeting in Washington, followed by four regional workshops, and there were 169 recommendations that resulted from that lengthy discussion.

The Action Report was released in September 1971, as I mentioned, and since that time there has been a continuation of that effort. One of the things that I think has prevailed throughout this entire process has been a situation of extremes as far as the expected results from this effort. On the one hand there was extreme pessimism that anything constructive would come from it, and on the other hand there was extreme optimism that great things would result from this extensive effort. I think this latter is the attitude that many of us had when we started on this Action Report.

I am going to cut this fairly short and just get down to some of the recommendations; in fact, I am going to take them in order. If you have any questions, you are free to interrupt me if you like, or you can wait until the end - whichever you prefer.

First of all, one of the first recommendations that was achieved was that a permanent National Coordinating Committee

was established and is functioning on a continuing basis. Under the capable chairmanship of Ray Arnett, Director of the California Department of Fish and Game, the committee met in its organizing session last November in Washington. It identified 12 items for priority attention and circulated for attention its first report, with those recommendations, among the State fish and game departments and the National conservation organizations. Mr. Arnett, in transmitting the report, noted that the recommendations are addressed to anyone having the authority and ability to implement them. This suggestion is extremely important. It emphasizes that we are all in this effort together, each pursuing common objectives. Conservation interests must consider themselves a unified force, in this endeavor, each entity carrying out that part of the total responsibility to the resource for which he is best equipped. The time for fragmented and divisive approaches to conservation issues is gone! We need a unified front in dealing with major environmental problems. The Action Report is a significant step in that direction.

The first recommendation of the National Coordinating Committee, which in fact is only a carryover of the old steering committee which actually organized and implemented this series of four regional and one national workshops, was that the Committee should be established on a permanent basis. This was done. Membership is to include a representative of each of the regional associations including the Midwestern, one from the International, two from the National conservation agencies, and two from the Fish and Wildlife Service. The next meeting of the NCC is expected to be held this coming November, when the Committee will review what has happened over the past year and lay out some priorities and strategies for the coming year. The National Coordinating Committee has a great potential for future accomplishment because it is representative of the entire environmental movement in this Nation. I like to think of it as the nucleus of an "environmental board of directors."

In addition to Mr. Arnett, the Coordinating Committee is initially composed of Ralph W. Abele of the Pennsylvania Fish Commission, Clayton T. Garrison of the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, Raymond C. Hubley, Jr. of the Izaak Walton League of America, Charles D. Kelley of the Alabama Division of Game and Fish, Thomas L. Kimball of the National Wildlife Federation, Carl R. Noren of the Missouri Department of Conservation, Daniel A. Poole of the Wildlife Management Institute, Richard H. Stroud of the Sport Fishing Institute, and Spencer H. Smith, Director of our Bureau.

Recommendation 2 was to place a high priority on the introduction and enactment of new and amendatory legislation at the Federal level. Comprehensive amendments of each of the items listed for priority attention have been drafted for well over a year. The General Accounting Office, which is the investigative arm of Congress, is now conducting a special study of operations under the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to determine principal weaknesses in implementing the Act. This report should provide a basic document which we hope will justify the amendments proposed. We have no time schedule, but we are hopeful that the GAO report will come out this fall and will be available at the opening of the next Session of Congress in January.

In addition, separate draft legislation has been completed to amend Public Law 566, the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, and Public Law 89-72, the Federal Water Project Recreation Act. The essence of both drafts is also included in the amendments to the Coordination Act.

In brief, they would place the Small Watershed program under the Coordination Act and would expand the non-reimbursable features of Public Law 89-72. Actually, the proposed Coordination Act amendments would also accomplish these purposes.

Amendments of the Water Resources Planning Act would also provide a new source of planning funds for State fish and game departments and would bring fossil-fueled thermal electric plants under the permit and licensing authority of the Federal Government. This in effect would also bring such projects under the purview of the Coordination Act and automatically insure a better oversight of thermal discharges and diversions. Automatic de-authorization of projects not started in five years would also be accomplished. In addition, a proposed new Flood Damage Control Act is being considered which would specifically authorize the planning and implementation of non-structural alternatives for Federal flood control operations. This is similar to what Keith was referring to, earlier, in relation to the small watershed project and other types of projects.

None of these bills has yet been recommended by the Department of the Interior. Several, however, have been introduced by individual Congressmen, and other drafts are pending introduction. When they become available it will be important to marshal the united support of conservation interests. We shall endeavor to use our clearinghouse informational service to bring these matters to your

attention at the proper time, and also to solicit any ideas or advice that you might have on these bills. We are particularly pleased that some State directors, and others, are advising their Congressional delegations of their views on those bills that have been introduced. We would appreciate having copies of such communications for informational purposes. Also, in the near future we plan to publish an informational bulletin which we will get out to all the States, showing the status of our legislative recommendations.

The third recommendation was that a research steering committee be established to review the status of ongoing research related to water resource development projects and to encourage a consistent approach to such research by Federal, State and private interests. Although we have yet to establish the steering committee, we have taken what we believe is the first step in carrying out the intent of the recommendation. The Bureau has underway a major change in the orientation of our own research, to reorder it to the program needs of such Bureau activities as water resource planning, and specifically to better meet the needs of the Division of River Basin Studies. Already significant research is underway or planned which will relate to such problems as channelization, the extraction of oil shale and coal, problems in the coastal zone and estuaries, stream ecology, thermal pollution problems, and the like. In short we are moving first to put our own house in order. We plan quickly to proceed to the broader but equally vital matter of establishing a steering committee along the lines of the recommendation.

Recommendation 4 was that the Bureau publish a brochure on the subject of stream channelization. We are approaching this by publishing, first of all, a popular version of our Bureau's guidelines on this subject. That brochure is about to go to the printers, and hopefully should be available within a few weeks. In brief, the guidelines state that we will only condone the practice of channelization in situations where human life or safety is at issue, where fish and wildlife values are minimal, and where no feasible alternatives are apparent. Purpose of the public brochure is obvious, I think, and we hope it will better provide the public with an understanding of the position we are taking on these matters.

Recommendation 5 was to establish a telephone communications system, adapting the present one used by the International Association or some similar type of so-called "telephone tree." We have established liaison with the International on this matter, through Dr. Gottschalk. We expect to

work with and through the Association on this general problem. The system would be used to discuss and disseminate problems which require prompt and concerted action by a large number of organizations.

Recommendation 6 was that State fish and game departments evaluate existing State authorities under their police powers and the public trust doctrine. The objective is to insure that all existing authorities are being used to the fullest extent. The consolidation of responses by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife may be instructive in that the experiences of various States can be shared with each other. Unfortunately, only a handful of States have responded and a follow-up letter of encouragement is in preparation.

Recommendation 7 was that follow-up investigations be conducted to determine the extent to which authorized project features for fish and wildlife were actually installed by the construction agency. The Bureau recently entered into a contract with Johns Hopkins University for such a study of Bureau of Reclamation projects in the West. A similar study for Corps projects has been initiated by the Sport Fishing Institute under a contract with the Corps of Engineers. They have coordinated these two contracts and hope to gather similar information on both programs. The small watersheds program has yet to be examined in the same way. As funds become available, we hope to apply the same spotlight to that program. Another future study that is being considered, and which we feel is equally necessary, is to determine the effectiveness of installed fish and wildlife measures and from that information develop guidelines for future project recommendations.

Recommendation 8 relates to several aspects of the Soil Conservation Service program. We have not yet acted to bring the R C & D projects under broader review, principally because we have several severe overcommitments in manpower and funds. There is no question, however, that we do not know the extent of environmental changes being perpetuated under this program. Therefore, we solicit your interest in this effort and would like to request that you provide us with specific cases where you feel that the R C & D program could be given more attention, either by the Bureau or by the State or collectively.

It was also recommended that consideration be given to the inclusion of enforceable contracts in SCS projects, to insure that supplementary land treatment measures are in fact carried out and maintained over the life of the project.

We have used this recommendation in commenting on a recent SCS Work Plan. The Department endorsed the position in its report on the project. It is too early to really assess the effectiveness of our recommendations, but we have instructed our people to begin using this strategy on a regular basis.

Another aspect of this recommendation was that steps should be taken to insure that the SCS instructions on the treatment of endangered species are followed by its field forces. This can be a potent tool, since some watershed projects -- particularly those containing channelization -- sometimes affect such species. It is equally important, we feel, to insure that endangered species considered include plant species which are endangered and which depend on certain wetland situations for their continuance. We have taken steps to instruct our field people to give particular attention to these matters. However, one of the main snags in this matter is that there are no approved lists of endangered plant species.

Recommendation 9 was that the Bureau assess the need for and undertake a review of the 1954 wetlands inventory. There is no question, I think, that such an inventory updating is needed. Wetlands are increasingly recognized as a critical and diminishing resource, and adequate data are desirable to justify the degree of public control needed to insure their continuance. These data will also be necessary in connection with the expected enactment of the National Land Use Policy Act, now approved by the Senate, and with the probable implementation of the Water Resources Council Principles and Standards, this fall. We see the absolute necessity for a high level of cooperation with the State fish and game departments in undertaking the inventory. In this connection, we may be able to draw on the liaison and consultative assistance of the National Coordinating Committee.

We have taken initial steps, in cooperation with other divisions in the Bureau, to consider and, if necessary, develop a new wetland classification system to be used in any new inventory of wetlands. We are investigating with the Soil Conservation Service the possibility of linking our wetlands classification to the SCS soils series types. If a linkage of this type can be usefully established, large amounts of soils data now stored in SCS computers would be available for the inventory. We would expect that this kind of information would upgrade the quality of the inventory. In short, we are undertaking to improve our classification system, to conduct certain pilot studies if needed, and to prepare for an all-out inventory effort.

Recommendation 10 was that we should urge the Federal construction agencies to negotiate their research and data collection contracts with State fish and game departments rather than with private consultants. Objection to the latter type of contracts is that they tie up the people and files of the wildlife agencies in obtaining materials for the contractors. Wildlife agencies, which have the primary responsibility and trusteeship for these resources, should be the ones that benefit from the contracts that are let.

We have made a survey of ongoing research of this type, and plan to use this information in the near future in a discussion with reclamation people, the Corps of Engineers and other agencies that might be letting this type of contract. We have had only very preliminary discussions with the Chief's office of the Corps of Engineers in Washington, and they have been quite receptive about a solution to this problem.

Recommendation 11 was that the State fish and game departments and conservation organizations review and endorse formally the stream channelization guidelines issued by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. To our knowledge this has not been done to date by any of the States, although we plan to get out a questionnaire later this fall on these recommendations. I hope we find that some have adopted similar if not the exact channelization guidelines.

Recommendation 12, similarly, urges that conservation organizations and State wildlife agencies adopt the Action Report recommendations where pertinent to their individual situations. Again, only a few States have acted to adopt all or some significant parts of the Report to date.

There are many other developments which have a bearing on the future planning activities in the water resources field. I have only gone over the 12 recommendations that were made by the National Coordinating Committee, and I would like to give you a fast rundown on some other Bureau activities that were covered either directly or indirectly in the original Report.

For example, the Bureau has established 7 new coastal offices in the Division of River Basin Studies over the past year, and we expect to add up to 6 more in the next year. Our purpose is to place field biologists in areas nearer to some of the emerging crisis situations that are coming up on us. This would include, for example, dredge-and-fill permits in estuaries, nuclear power plants located in coastal areas, and the increasing volume of general work in the coastal plains.

We have also undertaken a combination air and ground surveillance program to identify illegal dredge-and-fill projects which are going forward without the necessary Corps of Engineers permits. We have completed a pilot program in the southeastern United States which has uncovered 200 such illegal projects. A full scale Nation-wide program is planned for later this summer, in which we hope to have the full cooperation of the State fish and game departments in reporting illegal dredge-and-fill activities throughout the United States and seeking appropriate corrective action.

The Model State Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, drafted as part of the Action Report, was officially approved by the Council of State Governments for possible enactment by the States. This, along with a non-game endangered species bill, will appear in an upcoming volume of recommended State legislation. We hope to obtain copies for distribution. Deputy Assistant Director Ken Black of our Bureau and Director Bob Jantzen of Arizona served as Vice Chairmen of the subcommittee which was successful in getting this legislation approved for inclusion in the list of recommendations.

We anticipate that the Water Resources Council's Principles will be implemented by fall. In anticipation of the planning adjustments that will be necessary with these new standards, we foresee the need to develop a uniform method of evaluating fish, wildlife, and other environmental impacts. We have already established a task force for this purpose and anticipate carrying out a high level of coordination in this effort with the State fish and game departments and conservation agencies. This coordination may be accomplished through the National Coordinating Committee.

As a matter of general interest, there is a work group in Kansas just this week, reviewing a procedure that is employed by the State of Nebraska. Representatives are there from, I understand, Nebraska, Kansas, Missouri, the Corps of Engineers, our Bureau, the Wildlife Management Institute, and I don't know what others. This is the type of effort which we feel we will be going through more and more in the next few months, in trying to come up with some type of a general framework of evaluating fish & wildlife and water development projects under the new principles and standards.

Implementation of these standards also means that we must promptly train our field people in their use. We are working on plans for that exercise, and would expect that State personnel will be included in this effort if there is an interest on their part. The new standards, considered in conjunction with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy

Act, can become a very potent factor in environmental planning in the next decade. Again, the key to its success depends on the intelligence and vigor that we bring to their implementation.

In the area of management methods, the Division of River Basin Studies has recently made several changes which may be of interest to you. We are trying to computerize our everyday business as much as possible, and have already developed our programming and budgeting computer procedures. We are now working on a new system of cost accounting system which will improve our allocation of funds and manpower, which in turn will increase efficiency. We are also improving our methods of reviewing regional and field office operations and programs to insure better nationwide consistency.

We are currently reviewing all sorts of ways in which computers and other modern technology can be used in our total operation. We anticipate that, in the not too distant future, we will be using electronic data processing in the evaluation of fish & wildlife and environmental impacts on all water development projects.

We are upgrading the quality of our personnel as rapidly as possible. This is being done by improved training and rotation through a variety of types of experience, by initial recruitment of highly trained people, and by the use of specialists who can address such specific problems as the impacts of nuclear plants, effluent discharges, and estuarine-related problems. We feel strongly that well trained, competent personnel are the key to the success of our operation. To further assist in reaching this goal, we are holding training seminars around the United States -- some of you may have attended the seminars that were held on nuclear power plants and oil & gas explorations. We also are producing a number of handbooks and guidelines on specific types of activities for use by our field people. We have some new and forthright policy directives which we feel will go a long way in strengthening our operations. In total, our experience, handbooks and the like are available to anyone in the profession on request.

We are also trying to improve our information services. We are sending an increasing number of items of general interest to State fish and game departments. We are not trying to duplicate the fine news services of the conservation organizations, but we are trying to bring out specific items that pertain directly to the national water resources program.

In summary, I think we can say that within the Bureau we have made an earnest effort since the beginning of the Action

Report back in 1971, to improve our River Basin Studies program. We are trying desperately in this day and age to bring together a marriage of the changing times of environmental efforts and at the same time reorganize and redirect our total River Basins program. We find that we need more and more to be able to react quickly and effectively in environmental crises as they arise. This means that we must have personnel who react more rapidly and positively than in the past, and we must have a better program, and we must achieve a substantially greater degree of coordination among ourselves, the State fish and game departments, and the conservation agencies. I think this is actually the main "spin-off" of the Action Report. We are confronted with a situation where there must be a division of labor in many instances. There are just not enough of us to go around, for all the jobs that need to be done. The National Coordinating Committee and the Action Report, I think, is a very important tool toward bringing about that type of division of labor.

I guess you could boil it all down to say that the job to be done is bigger than all of us, and there is no way we can get it all done, but we think that we have made a real big start with the Action Report. Initially, the Action Report started out as a focal criticism of the Bureau and the fact that the River Basins program should be strengthened. It rapidly grew to include the State organizations and the conservation groups. Today I don't think there is anybody who considers the Action Report as a finger pointed solely at the Bureau; it points at all of us. I think that whatever success we have in the future, and whatever we have had in the past, is a collective success. I think the National Coordinating Committee is a fine instrument to get that sort of effort done.

Thank you very much.

C. PURKETT, MISSOURI: I wish to make one correction -- you referred to the study being made in Kansas as the "Nebraska study". It is the Missouri study.

STEGMAN: Oh, I'm sorry...it is the Missouri system. I'm glad you corrected me, Charlie. It is the Missouri system, sometimes referred to as the County Line Reservoir System. There are other systems that have been used, several right within our Bureau. I think it goes without saying that there has never been a uniform system used throughout the United States by our Bureau or any construction agency to evaluate the impact of these projects on fish and wildlife. The reading we are getting out of the Water Resources Council is fairly clear that there will be such a system, so we

are trying to get ahead of the game a little bit and come up with a system that we can then bring to the State conservation organizations and say, "Here it is - take it apart, tell us what is wrong with it, and we will go back and hack it again." We have for the last several months had two of our own people working closely with the Water Resources Council in preparing for the implementation of the standards, so this is something that is coming and it's going to be with us a long time, and we are making a considered effort in trying to get ready for it.

C. THREINEN, WISCONSIN: I gather there are differences between what the Water Resources Council prescribes and what the Water Commission favors.

STEGMAN: At this point I cannot address myself to these conflicts too well, as far as how they may come out. Interestingly enough, as I understand it, there are several conflicting groups within the Water Resources Council -- sort of like a family that has different opinions within itself. How this will shake out in the final report, I don't know. Then you impose on top of that the Commission report with yet another set of philosophies and what have you. I don't know, frankly, how it is going to come out. Our people working right there with the Water Resources Council really don't know how it is going to come out. So far as the interest rate goes, this is a very controversial item. The last I heard, they were leaning toward 7 percent, and I don't know how it came out. It has vacillated up and down, as high as 10 and as low as 5 percent. The last I heard, it was about 7.

PRES. STUART: Thank you, Jerry, for a very comprehensive report. Are there any announcements before we adjourn for the day?

D. WETTERSTEN: Just a reminder of the Resolutions Committee meeting, and an invitation to anyone interested, to attend.

PRES. STUART: Incidentally, all States and Provinces are members of the Resolutions Committee. If the Director is not here, I hope that someone representing each State will sit in on the Resolutions Committee meeting.

If there is nothing else, we will adjourn until 8:30 tomorrow morning.

* * *

Second General Session - Wednesday, July 18, a.m.

(Drawings were held for more door prizes, and several announcements were made at this time...)

PRES. STUART: Now, to get down to business, we have a presentation by a fellow who has been in North Dakota quite a number of years, and for whom we have a great deal of respect. He is the Director of the Northern Prairie Wildlife Research Center at Jamestown, and has been the Director since the Center got underway about 1965. He is going to present a slide series and speak to us on new concepts in the production of waterfowl and other game birds in areas of diversified agriculture. Harvey Nelson...

HARVEY NELSON, B.S.F.W.: Thank you, Russ. What I am going to try to do this morning is to give a little introduction to this subject, mix it up with a little slide series in the middle, and then come back and try to summarize. Now, the title that is on the program may cause some concern, but it is not all really that new and different. I like to think that most of the things I'm going to talk about today are really no more than plain common sense.

As a matter of introduction, during the past twenty years there have been many changes in concepts regarding the breeding biology and population ecology of waterfowl, and the various influences that affect annual production. In North America, these influences are most pronounced in the prairie regions of the U.S. and Canada, where the agricultural developments have become more intense every year. Other game and non-game species that nest in the wetlands and adjacent upland habitats are affected similarly. One of the principal tasks assigned to our Research Center when it was established seven years ago, was to try to determine the relative impact of these various influences and to identify the various interrelationships that exist.

Among these principal objectives was the need to identify those facets of waterfowl breeding biology, nesting habitat requirements, and other factors limiting annual production that may be altered through management to maximize production on Federal and State lands dedicated for this purpose. A corollary objective was to develop methods for enhancing production of waterfowl and other ground-nesting game birds on private lands in agricultural areas. In simple terms, the charge was to develop better ways and means of getting maximum wildlife production and utilization from our remaining habitat, to meet public demands for hunting of these game species.

Sometimes, in trying to put all these things together, I think we tend to overlook some of the basic principles in the field of wildlife management. All of us were taught some of this back in our textbook days, but some things change, too, over a period of time.

In looking at the basic wildlife management principles that we're confronted with here, I think that there are three basic factors that control the number of birds and mammals that are present on any given unit of land. Of course, the interrelationship of these factors must be understood in order to determine the efficiency of a wildlife production unit.

The first thing that must be considered is biotic potential of the species - basically, that is, their genetic ability to reproduce their own kind. This factor in itself is never limiting. All species have the ability to produce more offspring than will survive to reproductive maturity. The numbers that do survive are dependent upon other influences within the environment.

In thinking about waterfowl in particular, I think if we scratch our heads a little we will realize that we are dealing with a species that has a very strong drive to reproduce. Given a chance - the proper environment or the proper habitat - they will keep trying and trying until they do bring off their brood for that year. This is not the same as dealing with a bird that may only lay a couple of eggs, or breed every other year or something like that. If you compare mallard ducks to sandhill cranes, it's like a different ball game. I think we are fortunate in that we do have this kind of potential in the resource we are dealing with.

The other important thing is habitat quality. The relative ability of the ingredients or components to sustain wildlife populations in any area is referred to as the quality or the carrying capacity of that habitat. This, of course, includes good and water, vegetative cover to provide security for the species in question, and security from adverse elements whether it be predation pressure or weather. Proper nesting and rearing sites for the young are also important considerations. Vegetative cover is usually the key factor in high quality habitat. Good cover will usually contain the necessary food, security and rearing sites for young birds and mammals. Only in time of drought, whether natural or man made, does water become limiting. For small game birds and animals, the general rule is the more dense the vegetative cover the higher the potential for production of the species concerned. Thus, we can say that bare ground has a nearly zero capability for wildlife production. Maximum vegetative

density with a diversity of species has the highest potential, and there are varying degrees of potential between these two extremes. The slide series will cover this. Cover is most critical during reproductive periods and periods of extreme weather conditions such as commonly exists during winter in temperate regions. It also plays an important role in predator-prey relationships. So, we need to be concerned about how we can influence these other factors through provision of proper cover.

No matter how good the quality of the habitat, the density of a population will eventually be limited. Many species have behavioral characteristics such as individual territoriality, pair territoriality, or group territoriality which set an upper limit on the number of individuals that can occupy a unit of habitat, but these limits are not really known for each species. For example, we don't know how dense were nesting populations of ducks on the prairie under pristine conditions. Sometimes we are worried about really stacking up populations in remaining habitat, and some would say that territorial requirements prevent you from doing that. But, as we will illustrate later, we have good evidence that it really doesn't work that way if the habitat quality is there. Other species may simply require a fixed amount of space for each individual to obtain its required food, water and shelter in any season of the year. But, if the space requirements are exceeded, crowding results in social stresses or damage to the habitat, which in turn limits the population it can support. So, quality alone isn't enough -- we also need to think in terms of total quantity of habitat available.

The goal of management, therefore, should be to produce habitat with maximum carrying capacity -- usually dense vegetative cover and a diversity of species -- and to produce this cover in sufficient quantity that the space requirements of the species being managed are met in order to maintain the desired population level.

I want to talk just a minute about some conceptual changes. It is a fact, of course, that some of the things we learned in the textbooks twenty and thirty years ago just don't come out that way anymore. Maybe it's because we have learned more things about certain species. It seems the more you study something -- the more you learn about it -- it appears the less you really know about the thing in total.

I believe that our research efforts have made significant contributions to knowledge of waterfowl ecology during the past five years. This knowledge and data from other sources such as the pheasant program, suggest a need for change in some of our concepts of habitat management. New hypotheses

have evolved from some of the recent work that we have been involved in. They need to be tested further, but as we go on we seem to see some kind of a pattern developing.

We have found that some of the earlier published information on certain aspects of waterfowl behavior such as homing, pioneering, breeding age, and tolerance for reduced territorial areas, is not as clear-cut as was previously thought. And yet, knowledge of them is crucial to sound management. For example, recent studies in the Northwest Territories have shown that less than 5 percent of the yearling female scaup breed and nest successfully. A similar pattern is developing in current studies on the canvasback and redhead, although probably a somewhat higher percent of the females do attempt to nest. Even in dabbling ducks the yearling females appear to have a much lower nesting drive.

The influence of predation on waterfowl populations and its interaction with habitat quality have become increasingly apparent in recent years, and the subject requires further investigation.

Waterfowl habitat can no longer be viewed only in terms of numbers of wetlands per square mile, but must be viewed as a dynamic system including many types of wetland and upland habitat. Changes in agricultural programs have a marked effect on waterfowl habitat, particularly on the quality and quantity of upland nesting habitat on private lands. USDA farm programs have a major influence on the character of such lands.

Breeding waterfowl depend on invertebrate foods that vary widely with wetland types, and the food requirements of the birds vary with species, age and sex. Our understanding of these food requirements and their relationship to water quality is in its infancy. It is beginning to come out that much of the old food habits work really does not answer the questions we are faced with today. Fisheries people, of course, have looked at this food thing in relationship much longer than the wildlife people.

Man's direct influence on waterfowl populations through hunting, and his indirect influence through destruction and alteration of habitat, are increasing with expanding human populations. These impacts must be clearly understood in order to safeguard the resources we are dealing with.

I think it is safe to say that there has been a gradual decline in the populations of waterfowl and other ground-nesting birds on most public lands in the North Central states during the past twenty years or so. This appears to

be due largely to intensification of land use resulting in deterioration or elimination of nesting cover coupled with increased predation, even on lands that are dedicated to wildlife management purposes. We have seen this happen and have sort of stood by and watched this thing develop without really trying to do too much about it. I am hopeful that information coming out of our program can be applied to help obtain maximum production from these lands dedicated to wildlife. Now similar trends are occurring on private land with the only noticeable exception being the response to land retirement programs such as the Soil Bank program and the more recent Water Bank program and Cropland Adjustment program with its many phases. These broad agricultural programs have really had a major impact on wildlife populations in the Upper Midwest, creating sizable acreages of idle land for periods of five to ten years. We know nest destruction has become a major factor limiting the production of ducks in the North Central United States and the Prairie Provinces of Canada. Again, this goes back to the intensity of land use and the impact of predation and the impact of human disturbance. Going back and looking at early studies, we see that back in the 1930's and early 40's, with limited data from a few nesting studies, they were getting 60 to 70 percent success of nesting birds. By the 50's this had declined to the 30 to 40 percent level; and now, in the 70's, it is beginning to appear that in many cases we are operating in the 20 to 30 percent level in an average year. So, we have had this gradual depression decline in actual nesting success, which is important in terms of the total population we get on the wing each year.

Two of the goals of our research in this area are related to getting the most production out of the remaining habitat. The first is to try to increase nesting success back up to 70 percent or more under intensive management on wildlife lands, and the other is to increase nesting density to one nest or more per acre on these dedicated lands. If we can do this, then we are getting back in the ball park. The important consideration here is the providing of nesting cover that these birds require, to persist from one growing season until the following spring when birds begin to nest. Right now, with six or seven years of research under our belt, we are fairly certain of the kinds of practices that can be applied, and the response we can anticipate. One of our major efforts now, of course, is directed toward identification of the proper growth form and species composition of the upland vegetation we are most apt to get the best response from, under different conditions. We realize that what happens in North Dakota cannot always be applied in South Dakota

or in Minnesota, but yet if we look at the broad context I think that the species composition in these relationships will generally apply. I am not going into any more detail, as much of this information has been published by fellows like Leo Kirsch, Harold Duebbert, Harvey Miller, and others on our staff.

Now, I would like to use a series of slides to illustrate more specifically the ideas I have discussed, and to show you some of the results that can be gotten from quality cover. I am going to cover a lot of summary information developed by other staff members - those mentioned above and also Tom Klett, George Swanson, Bob Stewart, Al Sargeant, Lew Cowardin and Dave Trauger. Many of you are familiar with the work of these individuals. Some of the information is recent and still unpublished, and hopefully there will be continual new information forthcoming as our work continues.

I would also like to recognize the important recent work concerning wildlife habitat requirements on private lands by Keith Harmon, Maynard Nelson, the Farm Programs Committee, and other researchers in the Midwest. These groups are vitally interested in getting cover for wildlife purposes whether it be through farm programs or agency programs such as our own. We need to draw on these different sources of talent and information and try to use it effectively to bring to bear on a good, sound management program.

(Mr. Nelson showed a slide series, giving extemporaneous remarks. Following are the prepared Highlights on the slide series....)

- (1) Intensive tillage, cutting of hay and grazing in much of the prairie region have greatly reduced the acreage of "wild land" or "idle acres" to the point where there is a shortage of upland nesting cover for most ground-nesting game birds.
- (2) Intensive farming and wetland drainage have collectively reduced the habitat base for breeding waterfowl. In many areas the only "islands of habitat" remaining are State or Federal wildlife lands. Many of these become important wintering areas for resident wildlife species, but competition for food and space becomes keen.
- (3) Studies on a variety of tracts (BSF&W and State wetlands, CAP fields, and private lands with other land use), totaling several thousand acres a year, showed nest densities of .5 - 1.0 per acre in good quality cover and up to 75% nesting success.

- (4) The highest nest densities (1.5 - 2.5 duck nests per acre) and nesting success (90 - 98%) occurred within the Fox-Pheasant Study Area in South Dakota, during the years when predator control operations were most effective.
- (5) Good quality cover without predator control produced six times as many ducklings as poor quality cover with predator control.
- (6) Block size, configuration and proximity to a good wetland base are important considerations. Blocks of cover 40 acres or larger in size appear to be more attractive to ground-nesting birds in the prairie region, and nests were more successful as size increased to 80 - 120 acres. Narrow strips of cover were subject to much higher predation and other disturbances. While narrow bands of grasses and sedges around pond margins do aid in siltation entrapment and prevent some tillage during dry years, such cover does not appear to be as productive of wildlife as formerly believed.
- (7) Studies show that the principal mammalian predators in the prairie region are the raccoon, striped skunk and red fox. Raccoons and skunks prey largely on eggs, whereas red foxes take a significant number of ground-nesting birds on the nest, especially during the early spring season. Female ducks are an important food item in this region at that time of the year.
- (8) Dense nesting cover in large blocks appears to provide some type of deterrent to predators.
- (9) Nests were found throughout the large cover blocks, not just along the edge, thus creating considerable question about the "edge concept", especially as related to upland nesting waterfowl. This may be a reflection of security and bird response through learning. Therefore, we recommend establishment of cover blocks 80 - 100 acres in size whenever possible, and discourage development of blocks less than 40 acres in size, if a choice is available.
- (10) Territorial requirements of upland nesting ducks seem to break down when local breeding populations increase markedly as a result of high nesting success and increased survival rates. As many as 18 pairs of mixed dabblers (mallard, gadwall, blue-winged teal) have been recorded on ponds as small as 0.5 acres.
- (11) High quality nesting cover is also beneficial to other resident game birds, song birds, and white-tailed deer;

and it has other seasonal values such as winter cover in the prairie region.

- (12) The value of seasonal wetlands in the production of invertebrate foods and their importance to egg production by female ducks has been largely overlooked until recently.
- (13) In addition to providing nesting cover, semi-permanent and permanent wetlands serve as brood areas, molting areas, staging areas for migrants and hunting areas, which are important in the waterfowl management scheme. They also provide important food and cover, especially winter cover to many resident species.

I would like to expand further on the announcement made by Deputy Director Victor Schmidt and Regional Director Marston at this meeting, that the Bureau is planning to undertake a pilot program to provide quality upland nesting cover in areas where wetlands are being protected.

As a result of Bureau and other research on methods for maximizing wildlife production on remaining habitats, it has been suggested that the Bureau consider the merits of a program directed toward the establishment of approximately 1,000 acres of high quality nesting habitat per township in the better waterfowl production areas of the Dakotas and Minnesota. It was suggested that a logical start would consider a pilot program for leasing about 10 blocks of 80 to 120 acres each, in each of two townships, preferably in North Dakota where there would be an opportunity to select one township in the Drift Plain and one in the Missouri Coteau region. It was also recommended that a control township be selected in each case for gathering comparative data on public acceptance and wildlife response to the improved nesting habitat program. The main thrust of this program is to provide and maintain quality nesting cover in areas where the Bureau has a high density of Class III and Class IV wetlands under easement, but has no control over management of surrounding lands. Consideration should also be given to private lands that still contain a good complex of wetland classes but where no easements exist, and to State or Federally owned lands that may be enhanced by establishment of larger blocks of dense nesting cover.

We believe it is possible and feasible to develop a lease program, similar to that provided under the Water Bank program, to obtain the desired 1,000 acres in each of two townships for a ten-year period. Estimated costs are about \$350,000, including cost of grass and legume seed the first

year and development of a system to evaluate response to the experimental program.

Much will be learned during the first year of the pilot program, particularly regarding public response. By the third year we should be able to determine whether it is successful from the standpoint of public acceptance and initial wildlife response. The remaining years will provide information for determining if high productivity can be maintained for the entire ten-year period. By the third to fifth year it should also be possible to determine if this approach is worthy of expansion on a larger scale. If so, then we would suggest that the program be expanded to include 40 townships each in the states of North Dakota, South Dakota and Minnesota. This, of course, will require a substantial increase in funding. This decision will also undoubtedly be influenced by the future scope of the Bureau's wetland preservation program.

As previously indicated, those who have worked closely with wildlife production in areas of diversified agriculture are convinced that excellent results will be demonstrated by the proposed pilot program. In addition to upland nesting waterfowl, substantial benefits will also accrue to resident game birds, some other ground nesting birds and whitetailed deer. Maintenance of quality upland cover also will provide other environmental protection benefits.

The next steps to be taken include establishment of the funding arrangements for initiating of the pilot program this year, finalizing program criteria, development of operational procedures for selecting counties and townships where the program will be conducted, selection of desirable tracts, and negotiations with landowners prior to the spring of 1974.

In summary, I would like to run through some of the basic things that we talked about. Differences in behavioral and physiological characteristics that influence the breeding biology of the various species of waterfowl must be better understood for more effective management. There is mounting evidence that homing instincts may not be as strong for some species (mallard, blue-winged teal, pintail) as previously indicated by earlier workers. There is strong evidence of differences in pioneering between species and age classes that determines species' responses to drastic changes in habitat conditions and permits filling voids when local breeding populations are overharvested. Territorial tolerances for most species of dabbling ducks are much greater than previously indicated. I am convinced you can "stack up" breeding pairs in quality habitat without loss of reproductive efficiency, to a much greater degree than previously anticipated.

There is strong evidence of differential productivity by age classes in diving ducks and possibly in dabblers, which must be considered when assessing production from an observed breeding pair population. For example, studies have shown that less than 5% of the yearling female stock actually breed and nest successfully as yearlings. This is an important consideration when we consider the fact that most breeding population surveys go blindly across the board in assigning productivity values to those birds that really aren't doing anything. We are seeing a similar pattern developing in some of our current studies on the canvasback and the redhead. Again, these species don't have a very strong nesting drive or capability as yearling birds.

I mentioned earlier that there has been a gradual decline in waterfowl nesting success in the prairie region during the past 40 years, especially in intensely farmed regions. This is a serious matter, as this is really where most of our ducks are going down the drain - we are not getting them out of the egg. The decline is attributed primarily to the influences of intensive agriculture in causing a decline in the habitat base and increased mammalian predation.

Our studies, of course, have demonstrated the value of high quality, secure nesting cover, particularly upland nesting habitat, to upland nesting ducks and other ground-nesting birds. The highest densities of nests of dabbling ducks and other ground-nesting birds, and high hatching success, usually occurs in idled uplands in an early successional stage and with good amounts of residual vegetation. Accordingly, annual economic uses such as haying and grazing are not recommended when the objective is to maximize wildlife production. The greatest production has been found in tall, dense vegetation that is rank enough to stand well under snow cover in the prairie region. Periodic manipulation at 5 - 10 year intervals to maintain vigor of the vegetation is essential. Nesting success is also greater in large, unbroken blocks of 80 acres or more than in narrow strips which are subject to greater predator activity and other disturbances.

This gets back to the fact that we need to better identify and provide the ingredients of a basic waterfowl production unit. Three essential elements to maximize survival are a minimum wetland base, quality upland nesting cover, and security for breeding birds using these areas.

Now, we can't do all these things and really save the duck population on just our public lands, we have to think of programs whereby we can do this on private lands, or at least encourage it to be done on private lands. So, closer coordi-

nation with programs of the U.S. Department of Agriculture is needed to achieve greater consideration for quality wildlife habitat on private lands. With various agricultural programs coming and going over the years, we should be in a position to bring these concepts into play at an early planning stage, and get these practices applied.

The impact of hunting on local breeding populations of waterfowl in the principal production region of the United States and Canada must be better understood to implement proper management measures. We have to be sure, if we are going into intensive management programs, that we have some control over the over-harvest of the local breeding birds.

Improvements in nesting habitat on public and private lands for waterfowl and other game birds will also benefit many other species of wildlife, enhance local recreational opportunities and provide other environmental protection measures.

The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife has started to apply these concepts in the management of refuges and waterfowl production areas the past 2 - 3 years. We hope to move into a more intensive pilot project, as I have described, for establishing upland nesting habitat to supplement the present easement phase of the wetland preservation program in the prairie region. Hopefully, from that point on, we can see how it can be planned for a larger scale.

I thank you.

H. WOODWARD: What general facts have you learned, as far as grazing is concerned?

NELSON: I think our work and the work of many others have demonstrated that annual haying and annual grazing programs, particularly on wildlife lands dedicated for that purpose, are not compatible. This can be used as a manipulation tool to control, but generally our recommendations have been that this is not a good practice if we are trying to maintain quality nesting cover.

F. PRIEWERT, IOWA: How many female mallards will a drake service? I am wondering what kind of a ratio it is necessary to maintain.

NELSON: I guess that depends on how long he stays around. Normally, they will pair off and he will be with just one hen, but we have evidence with marked birds that they do a lot more hopping around than we realize. A drake may produce viable sperm for a number of weeks, and in the course of several weeks he could service more than one hen.

My own personal opinion is that we do not know enough about the role of excess drakes and the populations to be saying, "Let's get rid of them; we don't need them all." I think, in many cases, we don't really know what the total seasonal use or the value of that bird is. On the other hand, you can look at some wintering populations in some states where they are carrying populations on a local basis of 80 percent drakes -- well, obviously, you don't need that kind of a ratio. When you begin to get down to the 60 - 40 range, I think you are getting to the critical point.

C. THREINEN, WISCONSIN: Does the Federal land acquisition program now incorporate some of the requirements you have pointed out?

NELSON: It is being applied on Bureau fee title lands in the prairie region where it has the most application, and it is also being applied in other aspects of refuge management. It is all sort of beginning to fall into place now, and this is one thing we have been wrestling with for years -- that is, how to put all these things together and make them meaningful and workable. We are now beginning to see how to apply this.

R. GOULDEN, MANITOBA: We are trying to come up with a program in the Prairie Provinces for setting land aside or taking it out of production. Could you give a set of guidelines on the desirable size in acres of the tracts of land to be handled in this type of program.

NELSON: Our recommendation to date, based on just our own research, indicates that if you get down below 40 acres you begin to get a very marked decrease in utilization, and particularly in nesting success. The smaller the block, or a change in form, the greater the possibility for penetration of other influence -- whether it be predators, or mechanical disturbance, or people, or whatever. If you have a choice, we would say to go to 80 acres or above, but sometimes you don't have a choice; 40 acres, I think, is also a reasonable approach. I think what this really points out is that putting in little cover blocks -- an acre here, five acres there -- to do the job, in this day and age with all the other pressures and influences, just doesn't get that job done for most species we're talking about.

(unidentified): If you were going to establish this type of cover on, say, a bare piece of agricultural ground, what would you plant on it?

NELSON: In this part of the country, our people have demonstrated and experimented with different mixtures and combinations of legumes and wheat grasses that seem to be

the best growth form. I think you have to look at the form rather than the species. If you can get something that stands erect, develops a dense understory very quickly, and will survive heavy winter snows and provide a good nesting site the following spring, that is what you need. Whatever combination you can put together to give you that in a particular geographic area will do the job. It might be sweet-clover and wheat grass in North Dakota, and it might be something else in Nebraska.

(same, unidentified?): Eventually it is going to mat down and you are going to have to cut it or burn it or something, to rejuvenate it, if it is a permanent area.

NELSON: Yes; this is what I mentioned earlier. We know we can get about 7 to 10 years of high productive value out of such plantings, particularly on retired agricultural lands -- probably less than that in grasslands where we are dealing with a native species only. You may have to throw in some manipulation at a 5-year interval or such. But on retired croplands where your planting was the mixture originally, it looks like you can get 7 to 10 years, in this part of the country with normal rainfall. Then you will need to manipulate it some way, mechanically or by burning or whatever. Ideally, of course, if you had a program where you could move over and put that tract back into agricultural operation and retire another block next to it, this would be the perfect situation.

G. DELLINGER, MISSOURI: Do you have any figures on the predator control program, as to the kinds and numbers of predators controlled and the methods, in some of your study areas?

NELSON: We have not been directly involved with the control operation. We took advantage of the research program of South Dakota where they were studying the impact of intensive control on pheasant reproduction. I think that perhaps they could tell you better than I.

W. BARBEE, NEBRASKA: I'd like to explore the question of the kind of cover you would put on bare ground. Are you doing any work with the experiment stations on the kinds of alfalfa that might be put on this kind of land? If we look at alfalfa as a dairyman or livestock man does, we look for dense, fine, quality hay, not very stemmy. That kind of cultivated grass is fine-leafed and doesn't have the stand-up quality that we want on residual cover. All the way along, it seems to me, we as wildlife managers have accepted the agricultural plants that have been selected and improved for utilization as forage and grain, and not looked at these plants in terms of

their value to wildlife; and they are not compatible. Are you looking for varieties of alfalfa, or varieties of sweet clover, or varieties of grasses that are stemmy, coarse and stand up, and maybe unpalatable to livestock?

NELSON: We have had some discussions with the people at the Mandan research station of A.R.S. about this very thing. We have not entered this particular type of research directly ourselves. Most of our discussions have been an attempt to utilize their knowledge about existing plants suited for this general area. We needed to get back to compositions like Alfalfa, sweet clover, wheat grasses and those kinds of plants that provide the growth form. I think there is a lot more that should be done in terms of variety. You may have a situation in Nebraska that would be entirely different in kind of species composition than what we are talking about here, because of temperature and rainfall differences. We would like to pursue that further, and we need to, in our own program. Right now, we sort of have more than we can handle.

BARBEE: It occurs to me that plant breeders in their "seed banks" may carry certain strains that are not particularly good for forage, say, but they carry them because they use them for crossing to get away from things like rust, blight or wilt. I am suspicious that there are some strains or plants in the seed banks that are better wildlife plants than the accepted ones that are selected and developed for agriculture.

NELSON: I think you are right. That is the advantage to some of the wheat grasses, as they grow rapidly and are fairly rank, and even under normal grazing intensity they aren't utilized that fully. But, it is a good point, and needs more work.

D. VESALL, MINNESOTA: What are the estimated costs, per acre, to the landowner for establishing cover of this type?

NELSON: I think, Dave, in our discussions to date we have used the example of the Water Bank program, where they were successful in getting participation and compliance on a basis of \$5 to \$8 on wetlands and \$10 to \$12 on uplands, per acre.

VESALL: Your work stresses the importance of fee title acquisition of land for wildlife purposes whenever agencies have the opportunity to do so. Do you anticipate pretty good cooperation from private landowners?

NELSON: Well, bearing in mind that we are talking about trying this in areas where we already have a high density of wetlands under easement but no control over land management,

our thought is that this has the best potential for enhancing our previous investment and doing something about maximizing production of upland nesting birds in that area. The response we get would depend on economic conditions in any one year, and I suspect right now, in view of increases in crop prices for example, that participation in the Water Bank program isn't at the same level it was a year ago. But we must expect these things to change from year to year. That is the reason we are talking about this pilot program, which is an attempt to determine response and public participation and interest and whether in fact we can carry out such a program -- rather than really testing the biological application of it. We are pretty sure what to expect in that regard. There is no doubt that there is a better opportunity to do these things where we have public ownership. It gets back to the fact that, where we only have easements, we don't have the opportunity to manage. This program would supplement this situation.

PRES. STUART: Thank you, Harvey, for a very interesting presentation. After a short recess for coffee, we will commence our business session.

(recess)

PRES. STUART: We will start the business session with the Committee Reports, and will call on Les Voigt of Wisconsin to report on liaison with the Pheasant Council.

(following is the text of Voigt's prepared report; his spoken remarks will follow...)

The Midwest Pheasant Council has been in existence for 16 years. It has served as a technical, research-oriented committee for the exchange of current information on the Midwest pheasant population trends, changes in distribution, harvest levels, regulations, survey methodology, and research.

The Pheasant Council has fulfilled one of its original charges in reducing unnecessary duplication in research effort among member states of the Midwest Association. The Council has also prepared an annual report of activities and has advised us of special items which have merited discussion or required action on the part of the Association. USDA Farm Program legislation including the 1965 CROPLAND ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM effort by Besadny and Nelson, and a report on mutually adopted principles of pheasant season regulations, are pertinent examples. Pheasant Council members have also served as a ready point of

contact for the Association and its member states for the purposes of obtaining outside technical information or expert testimony.

In spite of these past values, the time for a joint reappraisal of Pheasant Council membership, goals and responsibilities has arrived. The necessity of Dr. Keith Harmon, Maynard Nelson, and their co-workers to form a special Farm Programs Committee outside of the Pheasant Council and the Association should tell both the Council and the Association something about the need for reorganization. In past discussions, the Association has made it clear that it does not want the Pheasant Council to engage in independent bio-political activities. On the other hand, the Association has followed up on most Pheasant Council recommendations primarily by drafting and passing a resolution and then promptly letting the matter drop.

The Pheasant Council in its 1973 report of activities and in its 1970 and '72 reports has specifically asked the Association for direction. The Association in resolution number 19, adopted a year ago at Wichita, requested that a committee be appointed to make recommendations on the Pheasant Council to the Association.

The time is ripe. I would urge the incoming chairman to appoint a joint committee consisting of Association and Pheasant Council members to: (1) re-examine the objectives of the Pheasant Council; (2) re-examine the respective responsibilities of both the Council and the Association in regard to pheasant research and management programs in the 70's, and (3) consider broadening membership in the Pheasant Council to include not only research personnel but game management staff people as well.

The future of the pheasant is basically tied to land management decisions made by private landowners who are going to be primarily influenced by Federal farm programs and/or broad land-use regulations. The fundamental problem of the 70's is not the need for additional research on pheasant physiology or even habitat requirements; it is in finding a way to save critical components of pheasant habitat still remaining or in finding a way to restore some of that which has been lost.

This will require the involvement of management personnel as well as research.

Finally, the Association must find more effective ways to provide inputs into Farm Program legislation, Administration of Farm Programs, Federal reclamation programs, and land use regulations that affect not only pheasant habitat and hunting opportunities but sound land-use decisions as well.

LES VOIGT, WISCONSIN: In all due candor, Russ, I'll have to admit that liaison with the Pheasant Council was somewhat limited. I was marooned in a snowstorm down in Louisville, Kentucky, and the Pheasant Council was marooned also, and they didn't really get together for their annual meeting. But the activities of the Council were monitored for me by Ed Frank of our game division.

Looking at it from the standpoint of a department administrator, I think we are rather at the crossroads where some decisions have to be made relative to the role of the Pheasant Council and its relationship to the Association. In Resolution No. 19 of the last meeting a request was made that a committee be appointed by the Association to audit and review and make recommendations as to the future role of the Council, and whether the present activities of the Council is just what the Association wants. Now, in my capacity as appointed liaison between the two groups, I would like to reiterate that request -- that the incoming President appoint such a committee, with participation by the Council and members of the Association, as it is time to re-evaluate whether this is really the function that we want this committee to perform for us. We fully recognize the many contributions that the Pheasant Council has made, but changing conditions, changing formats and changing organizations make it imperative that we have an audit of the Council's activities to give it new guidance and force. With this rejuvenation and added emphasis, I hope, on the part of the Council, they will be better able to serve the Association. I know they are somewhat puzzled as to whether they should make certain types of recommendations or whether these should be reserved for the Association.

For specifics on activities of the Pheasant Council, I will ask Ed Frank from our department's game division to give us a report.

EDWARD FRANK, WISCONSIN: The main activity in '73 was related to Harmon & Nelson's activities. As you know, last year at Wichita, Ron Labisky requested authorization for a

special committee on the Pheasant Council to work with the Farm Programs Committee to achieve the desired changes in the land diversion programs. Ron, who couldn't be here, asked Les as liaison to give his report, and he sent enough copies of his written report so that each member State and Province may have one. I will just give the highlights of Ron's report. (*Labisky's complete report may be found in the Appendix.*)

Initially the Pheasant Council, in this special agricultural programs committee, polled all members from all the states to assemble information on the pheasant, on its economic contribution in each of the states, and on the cover requirements appropriate to pheasants in each of the states. The second responsibility of the committee was to prepare a comprehensive report, which they did; it was entitled "A Case For Modifying Cropland Diversion Programs" -- some of you may have seen it. It included some of the economic information that was gathered, as well as reiterating the requirements that the Farm Programs Committee and this special committee were achieving. I think some of the benefits were that they did work together, that they requested permission from the Association a year ago, and that they were seeking exactly the same ends. We are very grateful that they had the backing of the Association.

Some additional activities included taking the reports and visiting with some of the House and Senate official committees -- this was Chairman Labisky and a few others, in conjunction with Keith Harmon's committee. Another activity was the prepared general committee report which I mentioned. Then, this report was utilized both by the Wildlife Society and by the Wildlife Federation in their preparation of position statements on this same issue -- again, this was in conjunction with Keith.

An additional report was prepared, having to do with comments on the environmental impact of Federal programs. I should perhaps go into Ron's text for this. The report was entitled "Cropland Diversion Programs -- and the Environment." It was prepared and read into the records of the Hearings on the General Farm Program of the Committee on Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives.

As Committee Chairman, Ron contacted Jack Ehresman, outdoor columnist for the Peoria Journal Star. Ehresman had a featured article representing the information assembled by the committee, and in addition to that he took it upon himself to send copies of the article to outdoor writers in each of the states, with a list of contact people and Council members, for additional follow-ups. This activity was

separate and distinct from Harmon's committee.

The committee's views on cropland diversion programs and associated pending legislation were presented by Chairman Labisky on a Chicago television show on July 1. Ron points out that the audience of this show was 250,000. This is another activity that he took on, himself.

The committee also solicited support for its views on cropland diversion programs from farm organizations. This was handled basically by each committee member within his state.

As Chairman, Ron was also asked to comment on Title X of the House's current farm bill. This was a result of contact by one of the legislators in Illinois.

Ron comments at the end that these efforts are toward essentially the same goals as those of Keith Harmon's committee, that they worked closely on this and were successful at least to the point that Keith pointed out, and that there are changes afoot which we hope will pass. He expresses thanks for the very important role played by Keith Harmon and Maynard Nelson. He points out that this is not the time to sit back and rest on this issue -- even if changes are incorporated in Federal Program legislation, there are administrative decisions in the actual implementation of the program which must be monitored. I think, myself, that this is going to be one of the important considerations to which the study committee on the role of the Council and the responsibility of the Association is going to have to address itself.

We also have a report of the 1973 activities of the Midwest Pheasant Council, prepared for the Association by Eugene D. Klonglan as immediate past president. (*See the Appendix for the full report.*) There are not any important issues that need to be discussed here, but I note that in the final paragraph the Council again specifically requests that the Association give it direction. So, I will agree with Les that the time is right for re-evaluation. They want to know where they stand and what they ought to be doing to better serve you.

PRES. STUART: Thank you, gentlemen. I would like to apologize to the Association, as I was derelict in not appointing this committee for this year. Actually, I am very interested and in fact was instrumental in introducing Resolution No. 19 last year but I forgot about it until I got the proceedings about ten days ago, and read the resolution.

As you know, the incoming President does not take over until January 1. So, if it is all right with the group, I'm going to appoint that committee to get to work in the ensuing year and come up with a report a year hence. I would like to place on that committee Mr. Les Voigt of Wisconsin, Willard Barbee of Nebraska, and Carl Noren of Missouri.

It has been my experience in many organizations that there is a tendency, when a crisis or a problem arises, to appoint a committee and then let the committee continue on with no cut-off date of any sort. As far as this Association is concerned, I think committees are fine, and they perform a very vital function. But, when it comes to the point where the work they are doing is obsolete or an unnecessary duplication, I think it is time they are put on a standing basis and then made use of again a few years hence if the need arises. I am in hopes that you fellows will get together during this next year and review this situation, as well as other committees. Also, I think that administrators are faced with the fact that these committees tend to grow -- for instance, I was rather surprised two years back to find that our people were going to Pennsylvania to a meeting of the Pheasant Council, although I could find nothing in the records where the State of Pennsylvania was a part of the Pheasant Council or a part of the Midwest. I know we appreciate that our field people do like to get together with their fellow workers from other states, and there are pressures, but we as administrators should have a closer rein on that type of thing.

Next on the agenda is the report from the Water Resources committee -- Willard Barbee.

WILLARD BARBEE, NEBRASKA: Mr. President, I take absolutely no responsibility if the good name of the State of Wisconsin is in jeopardy as the result of the printing error here, which indicates that Barbee is a part of the Wisconsin staff.

When I got my committee assignment from the President to chair this committee, which last year was chaired by Farrell Copelin, I went to work on gathering material as it related to the symposiums and the work groups that had been sponsored and fostered by the Fish and Wildlife Service. Then, the other day when I got my copy of the 1972 annual report and read it, I found that the Water Resources committee made up of Milo Casey, Arnold Mitchell and Mr. Couldwell from Saskatchewan, by resolution of last year's committee, was to stage a symposium here today at which time we would discuss these things. In looking at the

report again, I saw that Jerry Stegman was going to do just this very thing; and in light of the very outstanding and thorough report that Jerry brought us yesterday, I discarded the material that I had gotten together. But, I would like to say to the directors of the member States of the Association that we all respond quickly to any communication that we have with Ray Arnett as the chairman of the National Coordination Committee, and it occurs to me that the development of a "telephone tree" for rapid dissemination of information is a very worthwhile tool. It does work very effectively in some of the other groups that we as directors are associated with.

Now, as you will recall from last year's meeting, Farrell Copelin had done yeoman service for two or three years in the area of working to bring together various concerned States and the Corps of Engineers to review and try to alter the kind of lease arrangement or permit for the management of agricultural lands around Corps of Engineers reservoirs. We had quite a lot of input from Paul Lenzini, our legal counsel in Washington, and we arrived at a point where it was decided that the Corps felt that some of the things that were concerning us could be handled under a revision of the leasing arrangement that they have. I visited here at the meeting yesterday with Tony Kramer of the Corps, and he advises me that it is his understanding that the Corps will implement a leasing arrangement on a couple of the reservoirs in Oklahoma whereby there would be more direct control over grazing, that fencing would result from the lease hold, and that payment in kind would take care of this. It is too early to see whether this arrangement is going to effectively give us the kind of a license or lease that we can use to best manage these Corps lands.

I would like to bring up some other points. When the preliminary Water Resources Council report came out, I know it created quite a stir in states where the Bureau of Reclamation operates, when the report rather bluntly suggested that those that use the water pay their share. I know that, in our state, our Governor and our Soil and Water Commission went to Phoenix together to a public hearing and the report that they made was certainly contrary to the position that we took on the Water Resources Council position. I hope that, by another year, the report and recommendations therein will begin to crystalize. As Jerry pointed out here yesterday, much of the legislation that we have discussed in the symposiums -- the one in Washington and the regional workshop sessions -- is still in the formative or discussion stage. With that, I would recommend, Mr. President, that the Water Resources committee be continued and that either we have another progress report

from Jerry Stegman or that we convene a workshop symposium as was outlined in our instructions in the annual report.

PRES. STUART: Thank you, Willard. I will convey your recommendation to the incoming President.

We have a couple more reports. The report on the Pro Hunt committee is given by Charles Purkett of Missouri, pinch-hitting for Carl Noren.

CHARLES PURKETT, MISSOURI: First of all, Carl is very sorry he couldn't be here, but the Commission meeting with the Governor that had been scheduled for the 20th had to be unexpectedly held on the 17th because of the Governor's schedule.

Someone asked if there were problems; there are none that I know of. I have the report here, of the results of a questionnaire sent out by the Pro Hunt committee, which I will read. Carl asked me to recognize Larry Gale's input into this. Larry put the letter together and prepared part of the comments, for publication in the minutes.

Following the questionnaire that was sent out by letter, replies were received from 40 States plus Guam, and six Canadian Provinces. A few questions were not answered, and in other instances more than one answer was checked. The Provinces were tabulated separately to determine whether they might show a different pattern from the States.

The first question attempted to evaluate the strength and extent of anti-hunting sentiment. Twenty-three States reported anti-hunting sentiment as weak, 15 as moderate, and 3 as strong. This compares with 4 Provinces reporting anti-hunting sentiment to be weak, 2 as moderate, and none as strong. Although human population may influence attitudes toward hunting, this relationship apparently is obscured on the State or Provincial level by the influence of the larger cities in all political subdivisions.

The second question involved the relative strength of opposition to gun hunting and archery. Eight States reported stronger opposition to gun hunting, 9 reported stronger opposition to archery hunting, and 23 reported equal opposition to both guns and archery. The Provinces reported that 6 experienced stronger opposition against guns; none reported stronger opposition against archery, and none reported equal opposition to both. We have no ready explanation for the different pattern of the Provinces, but perhaps our Canadian members can give us the answer. It is interesting to us that a pocket of opposition to archery hunting seems to center geographically on Missouri, as our evaluation was supported by Illinois, Indiana, Iowa and Oklahoma.

It is important to recognize the individuals and groups who actively oppose hunting, and especially to know whether many "non-hunters" having an active interest in wildlife are or are not "anti-hunters." A large majority of the States (37) reported that a substantial segment of non-hunters who want better management of non-game wildlife are essentially separate and distinct from the majority of those actively opposed to hunting. Only 2 States disagreed with that opinion. The Provinces reported an even division of opinion on this question, with 3 agreeing and 3 disagreeing.

The fourth question listed several alternatives for dealing with the anti-hunting problem. Only one State suggested that the anti-hunters be ignored, while 4 recommended that pro-hunting support be recruited by an active management program for non-game wildlife. Four States preferred a direct attack through publicity, news stories and motion pictures. A strong majority of 28 States thought both of these approaches should be used. Four Provinces favored the combination approach, while 2 recommended direct public relations.

Several specific proposals were suggested. These included (1) paint a better image of the hunter; (2) a concerted effort to acquaint the public with the principles of wildlife biology and management; (3) stress contribution of the hunter to wildlife conservation; and (4) purge the "slob hunter" from the hunting ranks.

The results of this survey, with only 3 agencies rating anti-hunting sentiment as strong, raise a question as to whether the anti-hunting problem is being over-emphasized in relation to its real importance or whether its true significance is misunderstood or underestimated. Without attempting to answer that question, it is well to remember that a relatively small group, if highly motivated, well organized and properly funded, may wield influence far out of proportion to the number of individuals involved. Recent campaigns against steel traps in several states are good examples of such influence.

Thank you.

PRES. STUART: Thank you, Charles. We appreciate your giving the report.

Because there is a gentleman who has to leave shortly, we are revising the program and calling on Dan Armbruster of Ohio, who is chairman of the Awards committee.

DAN ARMBRUSTER, OHIO: Thank you, Russ. The Committee did not receive any applications for this award, but we had two members of the committee here - Willard Barbee and myself -

and we unanimously agreed to present this award to this gentleman.

The Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners, at its 40th Annual Convention in Bismarck, North Dakota, wishes to recognize and honor one of its most outstanding former members by selecting him the Association's Man-of-the-Year.

This man has provided outstanding service as the director of two State wildlife agencies that are members of this Association. He has held various offices within the Association, including that of President; has served as chairman and member on many of the standing committees of the Association, including four of this year's nine committees. In 1971, this individual found himself in the unique position of being President of both this Association and the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners. It was at this time that the President of these two great associations took advantage of this situation and hosted the first joint meeting of these associations, at Aspen, Colorado, in 1971.

Throughout his career as director of the South Dakota and Colorado state wildlife agencies; as president of this Association, the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners and the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners, Harry R. Woodward has demonstrated the kind of leadership rarely excelled in fish and wildlife administration.

In recognition of his devoted service to the profession, his outstanding leadership, and his untiring efforts to protect the rights of the States to manage fish and resident wildlife, the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners takes great pride in recognizing the achievements of Harry R. Woodward and selecting him as Man-of-the-Year. His leadership as a member of this and other associations of state game, fish and conservation commissioners will be sorely missed. As members of the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners, we are saddened by the loss of Harry Woodward's leadership in our Association but, at the same time, are extremely well pleased that our relationship will continue in his new position as the North Central Regional Director of Ducks, Unlimited. We wish Harry well in his new endeavors, pledge him our cooperation, and look forward to many years of productive relations.

Harry, would you please step forward?

HARRY WOODWARD: Thank you, Dan. I really don't know how to express my appreciation, and it is with a great deal of humility that I accept this. I am proud of the fact

that I have been closely associated with you through all these years. We have had a great time - I have had a great time - with all the things we have been able to accomplish through our joint efforts. As Dan told you, I'm not going to be very far away; I'm going to be around knocking on most of your doors to work on special projects, and I am looking for all of you fellows to give me some support and guidance in your states on pursuing my current activities.

Thank you a lot; I really appreciate this.

PRES. STUART: Harry, we hope that you continue your association with this Association.

We will now call on Gene Gazlay of Michigan to give the Legislative report.

GENE GAZLAY, MICHIGAN: First of all, I might apologize to the members of the Association for not having copies to distribute, but so many subjects are in a state of flux and Bob Hoover and I just this morning were making a final updating of my report. However, as soon as I get back home I will have a clean copy prepared and if any of you would like a copy we will see that you get one by mail.

I would like, right at the start, to indicate a debt of gratitude to Don Douglas of my staff who did most of the staff work; I think he is doing an excellent job. Bob Hoover also gave us a very generous assist.

At the moment, the national legislative picture reminds me of a ponderous pushball contest between Administration officials who are trying to secure legislation to implement the President's environmental messages of this year, and another set of Administration officials dedicated to holding down Federal spending in accordance with the President's wishes. Sometimes you get the feeling that some of the players switch sides to make sure that the ball doesn't move very far. There are also some interesting diversions going on near the sidelines, aimed at circumventing the President's impounding of funds for various programs.

In December the Legislative Committee of the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners had an excellent meeting with Spencer Smith and some of his key staff members. At that time their thought was that, while the Bureau would be short of manpower to do the work itself, it should have funds for grants-in-aid to States for a number of Federal-State cooperative ventures, most notable of which appeared to be, in terms of new programs at least, the Endangered Species Protection program and the Predatory Animal Management program. Bills to accomplish both programs

were introduced on the opening day of the Congressional Session, and have had a lot of attention from our friends and enemies. There has been considerable action recently, so what I wrote just a month ago is scarcely applicable now.

For endangered species conservation, we want, in my judgment, a version that will provide for a genuine partnership between the Federal and State governments, which will spell out criteria for cooperative programs for the States to carry on the main effort, with substantial matching grants of Federal money. Our view is that regulations governing the taking or non-taking of resident species should remain the province of the States complying with the criteria, and that only where a State is unable or unwilling to provide needed legal protection on a resident endangered species is there any ground for Federal preemption of the right to regulate the taking of such a species. Further, we maintain that States should participate fully in the development of lists of endangered species, whenever such species are residents of the state. Adherence to such a principle would have avoided, in my judgment, the present muddle over American alligators, which are certainly no longer endangered, at least in the state of Louisiana. It seems obvious that the only practical program for protecting endangered species requires the maximum use of the biological expertise and enforcement potential of the States.

It is true, and Vic Schmidt alluded to this yesterday, that many protectionists do not trust the State fish and game agencies, and that some States need to demonstrate greater concern for endangered and non-game species than they have in the past. Nevertheless, the most ardent protectionist must see that without the full cooperation of the States, a native endangered species program simply cannot succeed. In that connection, those of you who have not seen John Gottschalk's recent very eloquent reply that he prepared to the editorial of the Washington Post should view that, because it very eloquently states the case for the States in this program. I suspect the Washington Post has not printed it.

As of July 11, it appeared that a very new bill, S. 1983, introduced by Senator Williams and reported, although much altered, by the Senate Commerce Committee in a July 6 Committee Print, may be the bill that moves. Its special virtues from our point of view are that:

- (a) it authorizes not to exceed \$10 million for assistance to States (but there is a question as to whether this is annual or a total amount, and the matching provision is an insufficient 50-50);

(b) it establishes an Advisory Committee to make recommendations to the Secretary, particularly with respect to the listing and delisting of species, and provides for five members of an eleven-member panel to be drawn from State government; and

(c) most importantly, in my judgment, in Section 16 the bill provides in effect that Federal prohibitions or regulations are not applicable in a state until the Secretary has declared that a State program is inadequate. I think this is an important provision that we will have to insist on, in the final bill that moves.

In the House there is a June 28 Committee Print revision of H.R. 37, but further changes are contemplated there. Possibly, and hopefully, if the Senate bill passes soon, the House will concentrate on it.

The matter of predator management seems even more controversial than that of endangered species. Dingell's H.R. 38 and several similar bills were introduced very early in the Session. Dingell's H.R. 4759, known as the "Administration Bill," is currently being reworked by Dingell's subcommittee staff. S.887 is the Senate version of the Administration Bill. However, recently the Senate Commerce Committee has been working on a revision of Indiana Senator Bayh's 819, which earlier was called the "Anti-Poisoning Act." A draft dated June 19 is called the "Wild Predatory Animal Act." This draft not only restricts the use of poison; it also forbids use of traps except those that kill immediately or capture without maiming.

Paul Lenzini assures us that he thinks the restrictions on traps will be dropped, and that two additional changes should be sought: 75% Federal funding of a State's predator program to a maximum of \$300,000 for two years, instead of only one year as the bill is now written; and directing the Secretary, in developing a research program, to include the States in the formulative process.

A complication which may retard progress, particularly in the Senate, is that Senator Church, a member of the Public Lands Subcommittee of the Senate Interior Committee, has asked that after the Commerce Committee has finished its work the revised bill be referred to the Interior Committee. Senator Church reportedly favors having State predator programs administered by the State wildlife agency.

So does Representative Dingell, but it is expected that any bill to that effect will certainly be opposed strongly by the House agricultural interests, particularly by Texas Representatives Poage and Mahon.

The International Association feels that an acceptable bill should specify that a State predator management program will be approved and administered by the State wildlife agency and, further, that any approved emergency use of toxicants shall be carried out only by competent employees of that agency. It is also important that ample Federal Aid to conduct the State programs be made available, since direct Federal control programs are to be superseded, and the States absolutely are not in a position to take over the full financial burden -- not to start with, anyway.

We want the Federal role to be that of coordination and research, the research to include better methods of evaluating extent of damage, and improved methods of predator control (including, hopefully, development of toxicants which are specific, humane, and without the potential for secondary poisoning). Further, if such toxicants are developed, we want to be able to use them as prudence dictates.

The stockmen, on the other hand, seem to want to revert to the system that prevailed prior to February of last year, with active predator control in the hands of the Wildlife Services Division of the Bureau, and free-wheeling use of toxicants. The claims of coyote destruction of sheep, since the supposed elimination of poisons on public lands, remind me of the astronomical claims of fox increase and damage when the Michigan fox bounty was removed some years ago.

In contrast, National Audubon and others feel that the proposals to allow use of toxicants in certain emergency situations reopen the door for the abuses that were so obvious in the old system. I wouldn't predict what the outcome will be. For my part, I think we can and should pretty much eliminate the use of presently known toxicants (with the possible exception of professionally-used coyote getters), provided we can keep using firearms and steel traps until something better comes along -- which we've been seeking for some fifty years.

The various fish disease control bills, especially Mrs. Sullivan's H.R. 6397, seem to be surprisingly controversial within the International, though I suspect this Midwest body would generally admit the need for Federal restrictions on traffic in diseased fish. Opposition is especially strong in Arkansas, Mississippi and Louisiana, which states have a considerable industry in catfish farming, and perhaps in Nevada. Andy Hulsey, the Arkansas director, has been a strong campaigner against the proposed legislation. Recently he has been joined by spokesmen for the purveyors of fish as pets.

I was surprised to find the extent of opposition, or at least skepticism, evinced at a recent meeting of the Legislative Committee of the International. It was such that I would hesitate to state what the present position of the International is on the question. My own fisheries biologists strongly support H.R. 6397.

I think Paul Lenzini has been in contact with the Committee, and there is a good chance that hearings will be postponed until after the International has had a chance to discuss the matter in September.

Amendments to the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act are of interest to the Great Lakes States. Two identical bills, both by Mrs. Sullivan and others, are H.R. 6396 and H.R. 6965. As they stand, they would extend the authorization of appropriations through June 30, 1978, at \$10 million annually. This is very desirable, but the bills should be amended to raise the Federal cost-share for a joint project involving two or more States to 75% instead of the present 60%, and to provide specific inclusion of funding for sea-lamprey control barriers in allowable uses. Contrary to some impressions, the sea-lamprey provision is not in the bills as introduced.

H.R. 2345 and S. 1133 are companion bills which would amend the Pittman-Robertson Act and the Internal Revenue Code to add component parts of ammunition for firearms to the tax list, starting July 1, 1974. The income would be added to the special tax on handguns and bows and arrows, half of which goes into the regular P-R fund and half into a special fund apportioned to the States on the basis of population, which may be used for cost-sharing hunter safety programs and the construction, operation and maintenance of public target ranges as a part of such overall programs. It is estimated that an additional \$6 million would be added to the States' share of the new tax. I think it's an excellent idea, and we should certainly support it. Some people argue that all of the revenue should be eligible for shooting range purposes, on the basis that most of the reloaded ammunition is used for target shooting, but I think we ought to insist that half of it go for wildlife management purposes.

Representative Roncalio of Wyoming and ten colleagues introduced H.R. 5986, which would prohibit the use of lead shot for hunting in marshes or other aquatic habitats, after this coming season. Our best information is that this legislation will not get out of committee. I won't repeat the arguments pro and con, for I assume you are familiar with them, and I'm certain that others here could give a better

detailed account, if anyone needs to have his memory jogged. The main question with respect to lead shot is, as I see it, whether industry can deliver sufficient soft iron shot (after our discussion I guess I should say steel shot) in time for the season of 1974.

One of the most significant items of legislation before the Congress is the "Land Use Policy and Planning Assistance Act," Senator Jackson's S. 268 and Congressman Young's H.R. 2942. S. 268 had extensive work by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee before it was reported out on May 29 and passed June 21. It provides for substantial Federal aid in land use planning to States that can meet Federal guidelines. It should be a strong incentive for States to set up a land use planning program and to seek State legislation that will enable the State to qualify for Federal aid. There is strong emphasis on safeguards for environmental values. Some States may have to recapture planning authority that they have ceded to lower units of government.

I will attempt to brief the effect of this bill according to an outline rather hastily prepared by the head of our Department's new Office of Land Use, with which we recently were charged by our Governor. His analysis may lose something in transmission, but it goes something like this:

There are three basic phases for a State's program. The first phase is the planning process, or getting ready. This preliminary phase is scheduled for three years after passage of the Act. It carries a total authorization of up to \$100 million annually for three years, cost-shared 90% Federal and 10% State. A participating State is expected to establish land use authority within a single State agency; develop an adequate staff with appropriate expertise; conduct thorough inventories of its land features, human geography, economics, potential, needs, etc.; identify the activities subject to a proper land use program; establish a program to regulate land sales or development projects.

The second phase of the program is development of a planning program, or getting into gear. This is scheduled for another two years, at the same rate of funding as in phase one. There should be 5 major programs concerning the critical areas and uses to be covered by the State programs: (1) identification of areas of critical environmental concern; (2) determination of key facilities; (3) development of public facilities and utilities of regional benefit; (4) large-scale development, especially of new communities; and (5) land sales or development projects.

The third phase is program implementation: a three-year phase, to be funded at \$100 million annually, but with cost-sharing reduced to 2/3 Federal, 1/3 State. The participating State must satisfy the reviewing Secretary of the Interior that (1) it has demonstrated its good faith efforts; (2) State laws, regulations and criteria meet Federal requirements; (3) its program has been reviewed and approved by the Governor of the particular State; (4) it has implemented inter- and intra-governmental coordination; and (5) it is not avoiding its proper responsibilities under this Act through the use of Federal funds obtained under any other Federal act.

For a more comprehensive analysis I would refer you to the 4-page summary presented in the National Wildlife Federation's Conservation Report #21, pages 284-287.

Throughout, S. 268 as passed stresses the need for Federal-State cooperation as well as inter-state coordination. We in Michigan think it is a generally good bill. I have seen one lawyer's analysis, however, which concludes that it seriously threatens States' rights, and I must recognize the possibility unless the States are watchful. On balance, nevertheless, I feel that S. 268 provides an effective means for getting on with a very vital work, with a large share of the responsibility clearly in the hands of the States.

Another group of significant land bills consists of those cited as the "National Resource Lands Management Act," familiarly known as the "B.L.M. Organic Act" -- Jackson's S. 424 and the more detailed S. 1041, and Saylor's H.R. 5441 (similar to S.1041). These would provide sadly lacking authority and direction for management of the public domain lands. As of this date, S.424 seems to be the vehicle bill, and perhaps some of the more detailed provisions of S.1041 can be incorporated into this bill.

Coming to North Dakota to tell this group about the Nixonizing of R.E.A.P., the Water Bank, and other rurally directed programs is like carrying coals to Newcastle. The best experts are from this very area of North Dakota and Minnesota. To stretch the cliches a little farther, in nullifying the Water Bank it seems that the Administration has not only thrown out the baby with the bath water, but the whole basin as well.

Congress has, of course, sought to do something about it, but not too effectively as yet. Dingell's H.R. 2296, which would be desirable, increases the maximum balance of the

Water Bank program, assuming that it is ever back into operation.

The chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, W.R. Poage, on January 15, 1973, introduced H.R. 2107 to restore funds for R.E.A.P. It passed February 7, the first bill to pass the House this year. The Senate passed it on March 1, with an amendment which included restoring the Water Bank program. A conference report was filed in the House April 2, but there has been no further tangible action to reach agreement. If a compromise is reached, the President is expected to veto the bill, but there are predictions of an override. Perhaps this threat of a veto is what is preventing further agreement.

On another front, Congress lost a battle. H.R. 3298, also introduced by Poage, on January 30, was to restore the Rural Water and Sewer Grant Program. It passed the House March 1, the Senate on March 22. It was vetoed April 5. On April 10, the House failed to override the President's veto.

The long-standing objection of wildlife conservationists to the Agricultural Act of 1970 is that it has permitted, under annual agreements with landowners, set-aside acres to be summer-fallowed or fall-plowed. This has been talked about previously. In many instances the result is that over much of the year the land is bare, or at most, covered with a minimum of vegetation. As wildlife habitat it has been a wasteland; aesthetically it has been dreary; and it has permitted a marked loss of soil through wind and water erosion, which cause air and water pollution. Wildlife conservationists have urged provisions of long-term rather than annual contracts and requirement that set-aside acres be planted to provide cover and possibly some food for wildlife.

Efforts to call the attention of Congress to this dismal situation seem to have borne some fruit. After an extended mark-up on an earlier bill, the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported out a "clean" bill, S.1888, officially known as the "Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973," but more familiarly as the "New" Farm Bill. Reported on May 23, it passed the Senate June 8.

As passed, the bill carried an amendment presented by Senator Humphrey and passed unanimously. This rather important amendment provides for five significant changes in the set-aside program: (1) set-aside agreements may be used for as many as five years; (2) cost-sharing for mandatory perennial cover is authorized; (3) State boards, including fisheries and wildlife personnel, are authorized, to advise the State A.S.C.S. Committees; (4) a National Advisory Board is authorized, to guide the whole program; and (5) provision

is made for heads of State wildlife agencies to be ex-officio members of the A.S.C.S. State Committees.

These proposals sound very encouraging, though I realize that the bill is not yet law and most of the desirable provisions are only authorized, not mandated.

Meanwhile, a House bill, H.R. 8860, was introduced on June 20 by Representative Poage, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, and reported June 28. I have not seen this bill, but I understand that in some ways it goes further in our direction than the Senate Bill, including some provisions of R.E.A.P., the Water Bank, and the Great Plains Conservation Program. It permits contracts up to 25 years, with cost-sharing up to 75%.

Both Senate and House bills provide for a Forestry Incentives program for owners of "small, non-industrial private forests," and for non-Federal public forest lands. The wording of the Forest Incentives title of the Senate bill makes considerable mention of recreation and wildlife habitat enhancement as goals, in addition to increased wood production; so, on paper at least, it sounds pretty good.

For some three sessions of Congress, there has been pending legislation that I think deserves a better fate than it has had. Currently, there are two bills, H.R. 75 by Dingell and H.R. 733 by Mailliard, which embody the proposals to extend the Sikes Act of 1960, authorizing expenditures for wildlife conservation efforts on military lands and, additionally, to provide funding for Federal-State cooperative wildlife management programs on various other Federal lands. State leadership is assured. The State will administer the funds that are derived from the program. If the State desires it, a Federal stamp, sold by the State, may be required for hunting, trapping and fishing on designated Federal lands, the proceeds to be used to finance the agreed-on programs.

Reluctance to push the idea may be due to the thought that this is a "Federal hunting stamp," but it is optional with the State. It would seem particularly useful in states having large areas of Federal land, particularly B.L.M.-administered lands, since these States receive very little in the way of wildlife management appropriations.

To be sure, the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture appear to have little enthusiasm for the idea, but the reasons somewhat elude me -- although it has been stated that they presently have this

authority. As a matter of fact, these contractual arrangements are in effect in three states -- North Carolina, Virginia, and Arizona.

A related bill, Sikes' H.R. 4327, simply would extend authorization for funding to continue the 1960 Sikes Act programs on military lands. There is a good account of hearings on these three bills in the N.W.F. Conservation Report No. 10 (March 16, 1973), pages 128-131.

Several bills would amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act to provide a larger share of the funds for densely populated states. H.R. 289, S. 922, and H.R. 4865 all change the formula for allotment so that 20% is distributed according to population instead of the 40% which is now distributed, 75% according to need as determined by the Secretary of the Interior instead of 60% as it is now, and 5% on the basis of special or emergency needs (a new category). The two latter bills are identical, I believe, and allow up to 25% of a State's allotment to be spent for indoor facilities. I think that latter will be very controversial.

I would anticipate considerable dissension in the ranks of the State directors on this question, depending on the particular situation in each state.

There is a rash of bills pertaining more or less directly to the Alaska pipeline proposal. At the least, they would remove the 25-foot width limitation on rights-of-way crossing Federal lands. Others support a trans-Canada route, and there was up until recently a reported swing toward proposals such as Senator Mondale's S. 1565, calling for a study of alternatives, with the idea that after the report is filed Congress itself would decide the issue without judicial review. Arguments against the trans-Alaskan route focus on the long traverse of tundra, the fact that an active earthquake zone must be crossed, and the necessity for trans-shipment down the ecologically vulnerable Pacific coast. From a Midwest point of view, the trans-Canada proposal has some obvious advantages. However, just recently S. 1081, providing for the Alaska pipeline, passed the Senate. Also, Congress has taken action which seemingly will pre-empt the judicial review function, to some degree at least.

I have the impression that the question of firearms legislation is less intense than it was a year or so ago, although a number of bills have been introduced. The early emphasis seemed to be on strengthening penalties for criminal use of firearms. For example, H.R. 102 provides

mandatory imprisonment of 5 to 10 years for the first conviction of using a firearm in committing a Federal crime, in addition to the regular penalty for the felony. It further specifies no suspension, probation, or concurrent sentences. S. 743, among other things, specifies the death penalty if the crime results in the death of a person. H.R. 184 would make the use of a firearm to commit certain felonies a Federal crime where that use violates State law.

Dingell's H.R. 3611 solves the question of what constitutes a "Saturday night special." It is a handgun with a "frame or receiver that is a die casting of zinc alloy or any other material which has a melting temperature of less than 800 degrees Fahrenheit." Sale or delivery of such would be illegal.

Other proposals range downward in severity from H.R. 2582 that requires national registration of all firearms and prohibition of handguns for private citizens except for members of a pistol club that stores its guns with the local police or equivalent. The next step is Kennedy's S. 982, which also would require registration of all guns and licensing of all gun owners, but is not quite so restrictive on possession of handguns.

The next step is represented by Senator Hart's S. 747, which does not affect long guns but eliminates citizen ownership of operable handguns except for Federally-licensed pistol clubs which securely store their guns.

Senator Stevenson of Illinois, in S. 708, would require Federal registration of handguns and a Federal license to possess one. It prohibits ownership of "Saturday night specials."

Representative Runnells of New Mexico offers H.R. 216, which would repeal the Gun Control Act of 1968, re-establish the Federal Firearms Act, and make the use of a firearm to commit certain felonies a Federal crime.

One possible good bill we could support, in my judgment, is S. 609 introduced by Senator McGee of Wyoming, which removes .22 caliber ammunition from requirement to purchase.

There are many bills with complex impacts in the area of environmental quality, energy affairs, and land use. Among them I would list the many proposals for regulation of mining, particularly strip-mining, and requiring the reclamation of mined lands; amendments to tighten the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act; proposals for energy councils, and so forth; proposals to allow suits by environmentally damaged citizens - that shows some signs of moving.

Some of the Midwest States should be looking at possible impacts on their wildlife management programs from the various proposals to establish eastern wilderness or wild areas, since the dividing line is the 100th Meridian which runs along the eastern border of the Texas Panhandle and then cuts through western Kansas, central Nebraska, and the eastern Dakotas. Thus, a lot of the Midwest becomes Eastern in this respect.

A number of bills provide incentives for owners of "small, non-industrial private forest lands" of no more than 500 acres, to do a better job of managing their holdings. They are much like the rider attached to the Senate Farm Bill, S. 1888. A couple of other forestry bills sound as if they should be watched closely. One is Meeds' H.R. 6256 which amends the Multiple Use and Sustained Yield Act to emphasize maintaining the timber supply for the United States. I think this seriously dilutes the long-standing multiple-use concept. Another is Sisk's H.R. 3174, which would give possessory interest to anyone who, prior to enactment, has a structure --or, after enactment, erects a structure under permit -- on national forest lands. I think this is undesirable.

Finally, while I'm in a warning mood, I would suggest an exceedingly watchful eye on H.R. 943, introduced by Randall of Missouri, a member of the Armed Services and Government Operations committees of the House. This particular bill would prevent any Federal court from halting any Corps of Engineers' project on environmental grounds after 10% of the cost or \$15 million has been expended on it. It applies to projects authorized before January 1, 1970. To me, this is tantamount to saying that once a Corps project is under way it should be completed no matter how bad it may be discovered to be. It does not quite make sense. Two bills -- the webless bird stamp bill, H.R. 2289 introduced by Congressman Dingell and the waterfowl baiting bill, H.R. 567, are seemingly controversial among State game agencies and I understand that both bills were recently opposed at the meeting of the Western Association in Salt Lake City.

In conclusion, it seems to me there is a disturbing tendency in some quarters to demand that we get on with various actions before we've established that the actions are good. Some of the demanders regard themselves as conservationists and conservatives, but I'm not sure they are right on either count.

PRES. STUART: Thank you, Gene, for your report. You did your usual excellent job.

We have time for one more report, and I would like to call on Fred Priewert to give the Audit report.

FRED PRIEWERT, IOWA: Thank you, Russ. The committee, consisting of Bob Hodgins, Harry Woodward and myself, audited Fred Warders' books and had a discussion, and there are a couple of things we would like to bring to your attention today. They are not earthshaking, but it is going to take some action on the part of the group and you will have this afternoon to think about it in case you want to take some action tomorrow.

Very briefly, the total receipts were \$2,483.75 and the total expenditures \$2,201.00; cash on hand at the end of the year was \$282.00. That is one of the important items — we are almost at the deficit spending standpoint. Before I turn this over to Fred Warders, who is well versed to discuss the subject with you more fully, I would like to call your attention to the fact that some form of permanent or indeterminate term for the Treasurer should take place. The main reason for this is so that the books are not moved around to the State or Province where the meeting is held; this has caused considerable problem in the past. With nothing more from the committee, I would like to call on Fred to come up and more completely discuss the deficit spending aspect and what we can expect to do about it. The big single item is printing. If you look over the books for the past 15 or 20 years, the money keeps going downhill until we are at about the point of no return. There is going to have to be some increase in dues or some other approach to this thing.

FRED WARDERS, KANSAS: My comments will be extremely brief. The one largest single expenditure of the Association is the cost of printing the Proceedings. In compliance with the Bylaws which were amended at the annual meeting in Wichita last year, the Secretary is to compile and have printed 300 copies of the Proceedings. Ten copies are to be sent to each member in good standing, 50 are to be sent to libraries, and the remaining copies can be sold at \$3.00 per copy — so far, we have not sold any. This particular Proceedings right here (39th, 1972, in Kansas) costs right at \$2.00 per copy to have prepared. This cost does not include the paper, and does not include the typing which was done by our own people. In other words, it was taken to them in this form; they photographed it and put it together at a cost of \$2.00 per copy. If we print 300 copies, it would cost right at \$600.00 to get this printing done. That is minimum. If you take and compile the material and take it to a printer, as Colorado did two

years ago, it is going to cost well over a thousand dollars to get the 300 copies printed. Now, this is not the only cost to the Association; I imagine Russ will have some charges to the motel here. What I am trying to tell you, gentlemen, is that with your dues, if all member States and Provinces are in good standing, and about \$60.00 in interest from a CD, the maximum amount of yearly receipts to this Association is \$690.00. This amount of money is being absorbed by the States to have this printing done. We started out with around \$5,000.00 several years ago, and it is down to a little over \$1,000.00 now. In other words, you cannot put on this Conference for \$690.00, or the States are going to have to pay it. Now, in my own State, to have this printed, it would be a little precarious to write a voucher for a thousand dollars, drawn on Fish and Game funds. So, Russ may plan to do his own printing, but if he should take this out and have a printer here in Bismarck print this, he is going to have to get into a \$1,200.00 CD. Now, we have the \$1,200.00 there, and that is it.

If there are any questions, I would be happy to discuss them, and I would like to have a motion on approval of the Audit Report.

PRES. STUART: Thank you, Fred. You are going to be here tomorrow, and we will take this up at that time. This is a serious problem and, although we won't take any action on it today, we had better think it over this afternoon and continue our discussion of the Audit Report tomorrow as it pertains to the direction we are going in, insofar as dues are concerned. Fred, we are in hopes of the registration fee pretty well taking care of the mechanics of putting on the Conference. But I know this is a problem, with the reserve dwindling every year, and it is about time we faced up to it. Maybe we will have to take in some more members, like the Bureau and so forth.

Incidentally, Fred, you mentioned the fact that we do our own printing. We can do this, but we are printing money right now, and I just don't want to take the press away, for printing the Proceedings....

Well, if there is nothing else right now, we will see you all at the Barbecue and Fish Fry this evening, and we'll continue our Business Session and Committee Reports in the morning.

(recess)

(more prizes were drawn for...)

PRES. STUART: We will try to get this business meeting over with as soon as possible, in the event that some of you have to catch an early flight. So, we will get right on with it, and I'll call on Dick Wettersten, Chairman of the Resolutions committee. Incidentally, I want to personally thank Dick for taking over this committee after the session got under way.

D. WETTERSTEN, KANSAS: We have distributed copies of about 22 resolutions, and there is one more that we did not get typed, which I will read for your consideration. In going through these, I would prefer to act as we have in the past, giving only the "resolved" portion of the resolution and not going through all the "whereas's". We would also prefer to treat these as a block, if we could. We will go through them and set aside those we have a question on. These were prepared quite hurriedly yesterday, and there are a few minor errors that we will run into. Ray Arnett, for example, has not yet been appointed to the job as Secretary of the Interior -- there should be a comma after the word "Interior" in the last line of the first resolution, or alter the wording.... Also, on Resolution No. 1, on the first line, I suggest the wording "regarding previous resolutions." With that, we will get into them:

Resolution No. 1 - Federal Water Project Recreation Act -- Be It Resolved that the Association....reaffirm the recommendation that the Federal Water Project Recreation Act be repealed or amended to make costs of facilities for anadromous fish, migratory waterfowl, endangered species and estuarine resources nonreimbursable, also for water control, storage and control facilities; eliminate the \$28 million limit on land purchased for waterfowl as part of water projects; ensure separable costs of basic access, sanitary and safety facilities would be federal costs; ensure that fish and wildlife losses be satisfactorily compensated before enhancement features are cost-shared; and ensure that the interest requirement be waived on cost-share repayments; and

Be it Further Resolved that this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, members of Congress, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Defense, and to the Chairman of the Coordinating Committee of the Water Resources Council.

The reason we added Ray Arnett is for his work on the Water Resources Council.

Resolution No. 2 - U.S.F.S. Funding for Multiple Use Management -- Be It Resolved that the Association... strongly urge the Congress and associated fiscal agencies to provide a realistic multiple use budget which will recognize wildlife management and provide funds for an adequate program in this sphere of activity.

Resolution No. 3 - Extension of the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act -- Be It Resolved that the Association ...express appreciation to the Congress of the United States for efforts to rebuild the Nation's fishery through the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act (P.L. 91-249), and urge the Congress to enact H.R. 6396 or similar legislation to extend the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act to include (1) extension of the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act to June 30, 1979; (2) authorization and appropriation of \$10 million per annum, which in part will support Great Lakes States' programs to carry out provisions of the Act; (3) provision to permit utilization of funds for barrier construction for sea lamprey control in the Great Lakes; and (4) 75% federal funding when joint projects involve two or more states.

I have overlooked one item -- it would be our intention to automatically send copies of resolutions pertaining to geographic areas outside of our Association or of some great significance to the International Association for their consideration in September. I think that we can do that without a motion, can't we?

Resolution No. 4 - State Agency Participation in the National Environmental Policy Act -- Be It Resolved that the Association...recommend that Congress provide sufficient funds for state agencies to fully participate in these new and important interagency decision-making activities as required by NEPA.

Resolution No. 5 - Commending Keith Harmon and Maynard Nelson -- Be It Resolved that the Association... express its appreciation to the Wildlife Management Institute and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, and specifically to Keith Harmon and Maynard Nelson, for their outstanding and devoted leadership in coordinating activities of the Farm Program Committee and congressional liaison necessary to effect changes in agricultural legislation to insure establishment of perennial cover on set-aside acres for conservation of our soils and provision of much-needed habitat for farm game.

Resolution No. 6 - Hunting Season on Canvasback and Redhead Ducks -- Be It Resolved that the Association...

request that an open season be permitted on canvasbacks and redheads in 1973 with the following restrictions:

- (1) that one redhead or one canvasback be permitted in the regular daily bag and possession limit; and
- (2) that maximum point values be assigned to redheads and canvasbacks with a possession limit of one redhead or one canvasback in the point system bag limit; and

Be It Further Resolved that, as the National Canvasback and Redheads Committee recommendations did not have full committee support in 1972, a majority and minority report be made available to all member states; and

Be It Further Resolved that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Director of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and to the chairmen of the four Flyway Councils.

Resolution No. 7 - Commercial Fishing -- Be It Resolved that the Association...refutes the common property concept of the commercial fisheries, and endorses a limited entry fishery that operates on the basis of quotas for harvestable stocks; and

Be It Further Resolved that each State and Province holding jurisdiction over the fish in its waters, and the Federal Government in coastal waters, adopt a policy to assure the development of a system of yields that will guarantee maximum public benefits incorporating both sport fishing and commercial food fishing values.

Question? Alright, we will hold this resolution aside for further discussion.

Resolution No. 8 - Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and State Cooperative Programs -- Be It Resolved that the Association...applaud the efforts of the Director of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife to enhance federal-state cooperative activities, and endorse the concepts presented to the Executive Committee of the International Association in February 1973 and recently forwarded to the states; and

Be It Further Resolved that states be urged to carefully review these proposals and suggest pilot cooperative projects as the first stage of implementation.

Resolution No. 9 - Federal Cropland Diversion Programs -- Be It Resolved that the Association...declare its policy to support legislation for cropland diversion programs provided that such legislation

- (1) insures that all croplands diverted from production are devoted to protective cover crops that will safeguard air, water, soil and wildlife, and

(2) encourages that the maximum acreage of cropland diverted from production be administered under multi-year contracts for the duration of the 1973 Farm Program, and that it be devoted to a self-maintaining vegetative crop.

Resolution No. 10 - Request for Congressional Hearings Regarding the Dredge Spoil Deposition Problem on Upper Missouri River by the U.S. Corps of Engineers -- Be It Resolved that the Association...urge that Congressional hearings be held soon to review dredge spoil problems on the Mississippi River and to consider all modes of transportation and relative costs, and that the respective state governments petition the Upper Mississippi River Basin Commission to initiate such hearings.

Resolution No. 11 - Funding of Sea Lamprey Control Program, by 1975 -- Be It Resolved that the Association...recommend that the President's budget for fiscal year 1975 include \$2.581 million as the U.S. contribution to the Great Lakes Fishery Commission's sea lamprey control program; and

Be It Further Resolved that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Conference of Great Lakes Senators and Congressmen so that they may be apprised of the sea lamprey control program and support the budget requirement of the Great Lakes Fishery Commission for the further reduction of the sea lamprey in the waters of the Great Lakes.

(As a result of objection and discussion from the floor pertaining to concern by the Province of Ontario for this program...) That is a good point, and we'll set #11 aside.

Resolution No. 12 - International Waterfowl Management Symposium -- Be It Resolved that the Association...endorse and support a plan to establish an international waterfowl management symposium to be developed by Ducks Unlimited, Inc.; and

Be It Further Resolved that this resolution be submitted to the International Association for consideration at their annual meeting in September of 1973.

Resolution No. 13 - Support for Arkansas in Challenging the Federal Cache River Drainage Project -- Be It Resolved that the Association...oppose the Cache River channelization project; and

Be It Further Resolved that the various governmental agencies involved be notified of the Association's action.

Resolution No. 14 - Restoration of Funds for REAP, Water Bank, and LAWCON Programs -- Be It Resolved that the

Association...urge the President's Office to release funds for these important resource programs.

Resolution No. 15 - Stream Alteration Programs -- Be It Resolved that the Association...vigorously oppose publicly funded stream alteration programs except in those instances where human life is affected or where there are no significant adverse effects upon fish and wildlife and no other feasible alternatives are available; and, further provided that, in those cases where stream alteration projects meet the above criteria, construction should not be permitted to proceed until natural resource values and recreational opportunities are comprehensively evaluated and recommendations for resource compensation are included as an integral part of the project and project cost; and

Be It Further Resolved that the Association encourage and support administrative directives and legislative programs which will ensure the protection and enhancement of fish and wildlife resources; and

Be It Further Resolved that this resolution be sent to the Director of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Defense, and to Governors of the states.

Resolution No. 16 - Depredation Problem Study -- Be It Resolved that the Association...urge that the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife begin a detailed study of the depredation problem caused by migratory birds in early fiscal year 1974; and

Be It Further Resolved that, after learning the magnitude of the problem the Bureau be urged to draft a practical list of solutions to the problem for submission to the several states for their consideration.

Resolution No. 17 - Federal Funding for Seasonal Employment of Students -- Be It Resolved that the Association... support legislation which will strengthen and properly fund

- (1) the Environmental Quality Corps Act of 1973,
- (2) the Youth Conservation Corps, and
- (3) the Environmental Education Act; and

Be It Further Resolved that this resolution be forwarded to members of Congress, the President, and administrators of the programs.

(The following resolution was read, discussed and approved...)

Resolution No. 18 - Opposition to Trout Unlimited -- Be It Resolved that the Association...communicate to the Colorado State Personnel Board, the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners, and the

Directors of Trout Unlimited our complete resentment with this recommendation.

Resolution No. 19 - the YWCA Position on Guns -- Be It Resolved that the Association...recommend to Association members and their agencies, conservation clubs and other groups interested in the wise use of wildlife resources, not to contribute to the United Fund or to any fund from which money is received by the YWCA; and

Be It Further Resolved that a copy of this resolution be sent to the National YWCA, United Fund, and to each state YWCA and United Fund.

Resolution No. 20 - Concern for the Federal Wetlands Program -- Be It Resolved that the Association...urge that the Bureau assign top priority to the Wetlands program by doing the following:

- (1) work in cooperation with the states to increase the present level of funding,
- (2) increase the wetland staff in the field,
- (3) conduct a more detailed wetland inventory, and
- (4) in cooperation with the states, begin working toward an extension of the Program beyond 1976; and

Be It Further Resolved that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Bureau and to Congressmen Dingell and Reuss and Senator Humphrey, and that the respective states bring this matter to the attention of their Congressional delegation.

Resolution No. 21 - North American Wildlife Policy -- Be It Resolved that the Association...go on record with the International Association to request that the committee complete its charge by recommending positive actions and guidelines, within a suitable time frame, to resolve the problems outlined in the aforementioned document.

(The following resolution was not submitted to the committee but was read and approved on the floor...)

Resolution No. 22 - Commending Senators for Their Agricultural Bill Efforts -- Be It Resolved that the Association...commend Senators Humphrey, Eastland, Curtis, McGovern, Young, Allen, Dole, Huddleston, Bellmon, Clark, Helms, Abourezk, Mondale and Nelson for their efforts in preparing, sponsoring, and guiding this amendment through the Senate; and

Be It Further Resolved that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to these Senators and to the Chairmen of the Agriculture Committee of the House of Representatives.

(the following resolution was also read in its entirety...)

Resolution No. 23 - Appreciation for North Dakota's Hospitality and Good Program -- Be It Resolved that the Association...express its gratitude and appreciation to the State of North Dakota and its Game and Fish Department, and its special appreciation to Commissioner Russ Stuart and his entire staff that made the 40th Annual Meeting so successful.

Before taking action on all the resolutions as a group, we should return to Resolution No. 7 regarding commercial fishing. I believe Ontario had something on this.

(There was considerable conversation which the tape recorder did not pick up. Ken Loftus of Ontario had suggestions for improving and broadening the resolution, which Charles Harris of Michigan agreed with. Wettersten read Loftus' suggested wording to the group, and it was approved for inclusion in the resolution.)

Regarding Resolution No. 11, Funding of Sea Lamprey Control: The question arose here on whether or not this resolution should be broadened to relate to the total funding of the program rather than just what is pending in the U.S. Congress.

DAN ARMBRUSTER, OHIO: I believe the resolution should be directed and make reference to funding of the program by both the Canadian and U.S. governments.

CHARLES HARRIS, MICHIGAN: The resolution was originally drawn this way because there has not been a problem with the Canadian Government supplying their full share of funds, but there has been a problem in this country. I would like at this time to commend the Canadian Government for always coming through with their share of funding for this program.

WETTERSTEN: Ken Loftus suggested that the total 1975 budget figure for sea lamprey control in the Great Lakes be used. With this change, would this resolution be acceptable to the group? Okay, Ken, if you could determine that figure and communicate it to Russ at your earliest opportunity, it would be helpful.

That, Mr. President, concludes the report of the Resolutions Committee. I want to express my appreciation to everyone who sat in the room the other evening for a couple of hours. We had a great deal of help, and everybody pitched in, and it made the job quite easy. So, if you want a motion on this, I move the report of the Resolutions Committee be adopted.

DAN ARMBRUSTER: I second the motion.

PRES. STUART: Any further discussion? All those in favor of adopting the report signify by saying "aye." Opposed? The motion is carried.

I want to thank you, Chairman Wettersten, for a tremendous job on such short notice. I really appreciate your assuming that responsibility.

K. HARMON, WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE: Something came up at the meeting the other night. Sometime during the next month or two there will be a need for two resolutions out of the Midwest Association -- one to provide comments on the final version of the Farm Bill as it comes out of the Conference Committee, and the other to express thanks or congratulations to certain members of the House of Representatives Agriculture Committee.

DAM ARMBRUSTER: I move that the President be empowered to take the necessary action on this, in cooperation with Keith Harmon of the Farm Programs Committee.

D. VESALL, MINNESOTA: I'll second the motion.

PRES. STUART: Any discussion? All those in favor signify by saying "aye." Opposed? The motion is carried.

The next committee report is the report by the Nominating Committee. Les Voigt is Chairman, but he had to leave the Conference early so I'm calling on Vice Chairman R. C. Goulden of Manitoba.

R. GOULDEN, MANITOBA: Mr. President, speaking for Committee Chairman Lester Voigt and members of the Committee which included Harry Woodward and myself, we would like to place in nomination for officers of the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners the following persons:

- for President, Robert Herbst of Minnesota;
- for First Vice President, Charles Harris of Michigan;
- for Second Vice President, John Popowski of South Dakota;
- for Secretary, Jerry Kuehn of Minnesota; and for
- for Treasurer, Fred Warders of Kansas.

I move these nominations be accepted and we cast a unanimous ballot for these persons as officers for the coming year.

PRES. STUART: You have heard the motion. Is there a second? Seconded by Armbruster of Ohio. I don't believe that we discuss nominations, so all those in favor signify

by saying "aye," Opposed? The motion is carried.

The Chairman of the Audit Committee, Fred Priewert, made a suggestion yesterday that we discuss further the funding of Association business. The picture as he presented it, and which is accurate, is a little bleak. I would like to hear some comments from the members as to any possible solution to this financial crisis.

D. WETTERSTEN, KANSAS: I recall that last year at the meeting in Wichita there was some discussion of this when revision of the By-laws was considered, but not much thought was given to funding.

F. WARDERS, KANSAS: At that time we were not in a position to discuss it. We decided it should be considered at another meeting.

PRES. STUART: Well, the biggest cost to the Association, of course, is the printing of the transactions. I am sure that the States -- and we will do the same -- will devote a lot of secretarial work and editing on this, gratis. But, when it comes to printing, this of course is going to let on a contract basis. We have to keep in mind that we have, totally, 18 members...three Provinces and 15 States... and at the present level you can multiply that 18 by \$35.00. We will have to keep in mind that interest is rather an intangible thing; as the fund dwindles there is going to be less interest, unless the interest rates continues to rise. We may have several alternatives -- one of course would be the raising of individual member dues; another would be to invite some associate members, and charge them dues of course. One thing we will have to consider is that we are now paying a thousand dollars annually-- the States, at least-- to maintain the International. I think it would be somewhat reasonable to assume a little more than \$35.00 to support the regional association.

D. WETTERSTEN, KANSAS: My observation has been that the State putting the Conferences on spends considerably more than \$35.00. Maybe we should look at the Proceedings themselves -- do we really want this type of undertaking, considering the expense? It might be well to think of appointing a committee of two or three to work with Fred Warders and make recommendations to the Association within two or three months. In fact, I will make a motion to that effect.

JOHN LANGENBACH, B.S.F.W.: Does anyone have any idea what the other regional associations are doing on this question? This might have some bearing.

D. WETTERSTEN: I'd like to add to my motion, that one of the committee members should be from a Canadian Province.

C. HARRIS, MICHIGAN: Second the motion.

D. VESALL, MINNESOTA: I hope there is enough money to get through the next year, as it's not likely this problem can be tackled until the next annual meeting, unless an opportunity to hold a meeting comes along.

PRES. STUART: We may have this opportunity. If there is a possibility of holding a committee meeting at the International in September and the committee comes up with some recommendations, we could have a special meeting of the Midwest at the North American in March of 1974. This would be perfectly legitimate if the notices go out and so forth. In this way, action could be taken at that time to actually implement any change — such as a raise in dues, if this is the decision — in 1974. These are just suggestions, of course.

If there are no comments, all those in favor of the motion will signify by saying "aye". Opposed? The motion is carried.

I will appoint to this committee Dave Vesall or Bob Herbst of Minnesota, Ken Loftus of Ontario, and, to get a little help from the States that are in more than one association, Bob Evans of Colorado. And, of course, I think Fred Warders is automatically involved.

Incidentally, the funds of the Association were not transferred. They remained in Kansas, and I think this has worked very well. There is no loss of interest income by the removal of CDs before they attain maturity. I am in hopes that Minnesota will continue along these same lines. Actually, with Fred being the Treasurer, there is no problem whatsoever. If money is needed, it's just a matter of two or three days before a check can be written. I want to thank Dick for letting Fred do the amount of work that he did, and Fred for the work that was done. Actually, Fred came to North Dakota and spent one day of work (and one day relaxing due to a storm), and was a tremendous help to us. I have promised Bob Herbst that we would send somebody to St. Paul sometime next winter to make that transition a little easier.



Any further old business to come before the group?

K. LOFTUS, ONTARIO: I'd like to make a comment on the scope of the resolutions. I can understand why they come out as they do, but I think there are opportunities in committee to alter the resolutions to an International scope. Broadening the resolutions would be beneficial in almost all cases.

PRES. STUART: I agree, and trust that the Resolutions Committee will consider this as one of their duties. Ken,

I think that was tremendously good criticism of all of us. We all have the tendency to become a little provincial when we draft resolutions . We are thinking of just our own problems. We should all look at this matter a little more broadly in the future, and we will be far more effective if we use that approach.

I believe a motion has been made and seconded that the report of the Auditing Committee be adopted. Is there any discussion? If not, all those in favor of adoption will signify by saying "aye." Opposed? The motion is carried.

Is there any more old business to come before the Association? Any new business? If not, I want to take a moment to thank all the members and all the people who participated in the program. All the individuals did an outstanding job, and we sincerely appreciate it.

Now, it has been the practice to escort the new President to the podium. At this time I would like to ask Dick Wettersten and Fred Priewert to escort Dave Vesall from Minnesota to the podium.

Congratulations, Dave. I now will turn the gavel over to you.

D. VESALL, MINNESOTA: Thank you. On behalf of Commissioner Bob Herbst, we are pleased to accept the gavel, Mr. President. We look forward to seeing as many of you as possible, and hope you can all get to Minnesota next year when we will be holding the Conference at about the same time. Our tentative plans are to hold it in the Twin Cities area.

See you next year!

PRES. STUART: Thank you, Dave. The meeting will stand adjourned.

* * *

1973 REPORT
AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS COMMITTEE,
MIDWEST PHEASANT COUNCIL

Prepared for the
ASSOCIATION OF MIDWEST
FISH AND WILDLIFE COMMISSIONERS

by
Ronald F. Labisky
Chairman, Agricultural Programs Committee

In April, 1972, delegates of the Midwest Pheasant Council unanimously approved the formation of an Agricultural Programs Committee, whose purpose was to make contributions to the USDA's cropland diversion programs -- particularly the Set Aside Program -- that would benefit wildlife and the environment. The formation and functions of the Committee were approved by the Commissioners at their 39th annual meeting in Wichita, Kansas, on July 26, 1972.

A recapitulation of all of the activities of the Agricultural Programs Committee during the past year would be prohibitive. Hence, I will provide you gentlemen with a brief synopsis of our efforts. First, the Committee accumulated information on the pheasant, which was used as a model species to demonstrate the critical need for the proper management of diverted croplands for wildlife, and reviewed the history of Federal cropland diversion programs in general. Second, the Committee prepared a comprehensive report, entitled "A Case For Modifying Cropland Diversion Programs," to be used in communicating the cropland diversion story. And, third, the Committee made a concerted effort to alert legislators -- directly and indirectly -- as to the environmental drawbacks of current cropland diversion programs and to provide them with environmentally-oriented recommendations for inclusion in legislation governing future cropland diversion programs. The basic recommendations relating to cropland diversion that were supported by the Agricultural Programs Committee centered about two major provisions:

- (1) That all croplands diverted from production under the Set-Aside Program for wheat, feed grains, and cotton be devoted to a protective vegetative cover crop that will safeguard air, water, soil, and wildlife, and
- (2) That the maximum acreage of cropland diverted from production be administered under long-term contracts (2 or more years) and that it be devoted to vegetative cover capable of maintaining itself for the duration of contract.

Some selected examples of our Committee activities during 1972-73 are presented for your information and interest.

- (1) Committee members, or their colleagues, discussed -- by one means or another -- the recommended changes in future cropland diversion programs with most members of the House and Senate agricultural committees -- including W. R. Poage, Chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture.
- (2) A Committee statement, entitled "Cropland Diversion Programs -- and the Environment," was prepared and read into the records of the Hearings on the General Farm Program, Committee on Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives.
- (3) The Committee instigated the preparation of and played a major role in the drafting of The Wildlife Society's policy statement on Federal Cropland Diversion Programs. This Committee was also instrumental in arranging for Chapters and Sections of The Wildlife Society (via TWS's Land Use Committee, chaired by Bill T. Crawford) to provide their respective Congressional delegations with policy resolutions on cropland diversion programs.
- (4) The Committee's general report (A Case for Modifying Cropland Diversion Programs) was used by the National Wildlife Federation in their preparation of a statement on cropland diversion programs that was entered into the records of the House Hearings on the General Farm Program.
- (5) The Committee, under the guidance of Jack Ehresman, outdoor columnist of the Peoria Journal Star and President of the Association of Great Lakes Outdoor Writers, executed a news media campaign designed to support our suggested environmental provisions for future cropland diversion programs. This campaign, which has involved at least 100 selected outdoor columnists throughout the U.S., has been highly successful in informing the public of our program; it has also stimulated numerous legislator contacts by the general public.
- (6) The Committee's views on cropland diversion programs and associated pending legislation were presented by the Committee Chairman on WSMS (Chicago) TV on July 1, 1973. The TV program is a weekly, 1-hour, outdoor-oriented talk show, hosted by Norman Heyne, that has a viewing audience of 250,000.
- (7) The Committee also solicited the support of its views on cropland diversion programs from farm organizations. Although most farm groups agreed with the general theme of our objectives, the obtainment of their support was slow, but eventually forthcoming -- at least by some groups in the Midwest.

(8) The Agricultural Programs Committee was asked to comment, through its Chairman, on Title X (Rural Environmental Conservation) of the House's current Farm Bill. This invitation was extended by Congressman Edward Madigan, a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, who not only supports our views on cropland diversion programs but who has also expressed a considerable, and positive, interest in other environmental legislation.

How successful were Committee efforts to modify Federal cropland diversion programs -- particularly the Set-Aside Program -- for the benefit of air, soil, water, and wildlife? Inasmuch as the Congressional Bill governing the future agricultural program has not been finalized, it is too early to measure our accomplishments. Conservationists did get environmental input into both the Senate and House versions of the General Farm Bill, but just how much of that input will be retained in the final Bill is unknown.

I believe the Association can be proud of the accomplishments of the Agricultural Programs Committee of the Midwest Pheasant Council in this effort. This Committee, by attempting to modify the USDA's cropland diversion programs, charged one of the seemingly inviolate bastions of governmental entrenchment. And, win, lose or draw, their voices were heard on the Congressional level. I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge the outstanding contributions to the mutual cause by our colleagues on the Farm Programs Committee, chaired by M. M. Nelson and K. W. Harmon, and on the Farm Game Committee, chaired by C. A. McConnell. Collectively, these Committees -- plus many friends of conservation -- put forth a tremendous effort on a vital environmental issue.

The Midwest Pheasant Council thanks you for your support of the Agricultural Programs Committee. The Council believes that the duties of this Committee represent one of its most important functions. How else, but through a Federal cropland diversion program with proper environmental provisions could we even dream about building wildlife habitat on 60 million acres of privately-owned cropland? Efforts to insure that proper environmental provisions will be included in future agricultural programs must be perennial; it is not time to rest on our present deeds. The Midwest Pheasant Council not only urges your continued support of the Agricultural Programs Committee, but respectfully requests your guidance and participation in all Council programs.

Respectfully submitted,

Ronald F. Labisky
July 13, 1973

1973 REPORT
MIDWEST PHEASANT COUNCIL ACTIVITIES

Prepared for the
ASSOCIATION OF MIDWEST
FISH AND WILDLIFE COMMISSIONERS

by
Eugene D. Klonglan
Immediate Past Chairman, Midwest Pheasant Council

The sixteenth annual meeting of the Midwest Pheasant Council was held at Mankato, Minnesota, April 9 - 11, 1973. An unseasonably severe snowstorm through much of the central midwest area disrupted travel schedules of many enroute to the meeting, and prevented delegations from Wisconsin, Illinois and Iowa (including the chairman) from getting there at all. As a result, there were several changes necessitated in the program and the meeting ended one day earlier than scheduled. (I wish to thank Dr. Al Berner of Minnesota, program chairman, for taking on the responsibility for conducting the meeting on short notice and under trying circumstances; this report is prepared for the most part from notes and information furnished by him.) There were 51 persons in attendance, representing 13 States (including official delegates from 10 of 14 member States and neither of two Canadian member Provinces), the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Wildlife Management Institute, McGraw Wildlife Foundation, University of Minnesota, Mankato State College, North Dakota State University, South Dakota State University and the South Dakota Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit.

Those delegates and guests able to make the meeting on time assembled Monday evening, April 9, and were shown a slide series by Earl Kopischke to orient them on Minnesota in general and Minnesota pheasants in particular. The business meeting originally scheduled for Tuesday morning was postponed in hopes more members would arrive. Thus, the forenoon was devoted to a discussion of future agricultural land use trends, which will have a significant bearing on future prospects of farm wildlife species. This part of the program was led by various agricultural specialists from the University of Minnesota.

Dr. P. Hasbargen, farm economist, projected that because of a two per cent average annual yield increase in crop production brought about by new technology, the amount of land needed to feed the nation will not increase from its current level through at least 1985. This means current cropland

diversion needs would remain relatively stable until then. Dr. Dale Hicks, extension agronomist, discussed land use practices in Minnesota. Herbicide treatment is common on nearly all crops, with 83 per cent of the corn and about 70 per cent of soybeans and small grain being treated. Insecticides are used much less, corn being the most commonly treated with 27 per cent of the acreage receiving insecticide application. Fall plowing is utilized over most of the corn producing regions of Minnesota due to increased yields of about 10 bushels per acre over spring plowed land. Dr. R. Snyder, extension economist, discussed political and institutional effects on land use. He stated that individual land owners are not aware or concerned with the effect their use of the land has upon the overall community. Zoning laws are needed to force this awareness on private landowners, with a definite need for exclusive agricultural land use zoning.

Closely tied in with this background information on land use was the Farm Program Committee report by Maynard Nelson (Minnesota DNR). The purpose of this committee is to document the history and impact of federal land retirement programs on our natural resources and to use this information to maximize public benefits from these programs. Mr. Nelson reported on data collected by the committee and reviewed material presented before the Senate and House Agricultural Committees in Washington, D.C. In 1972, wildlife biologists checked approximately 121,000 acres of diverted cropland on 3543 farms in 13 states. Field checks were conducted in both June and July to evaluate cover conditions during the growing season, and in November or December to determine the amount and quality of cover carried over winter. Fifty-seven (57) per cent of the acreage surveyed was unseeded, most of which was summer fallow. Half of the 43 per cent seeded was old established plantings with half new seedings. Over 25 per cent of the seeded land had been destroyed by July 15, and by December 1st the acreage destroyed rose to 85 per cent. Recommendations for inclusion in a long-term land retirement program are:

1. Perennial cover should be provided on most retired acres for a minimum of three but, preferably, five years.
2. Annual cover crops should be planted on lands which must be retired under one year contracts.
3. Contracts for 10 or more years should be available to landowners so that scattered tracts up to 10 acres in size could be developed for wildlife protection and the preservation of natural beauty.
4. Determination of eligible conservation uses on set-aside acres should be made by state ASCS committees.

5. An advisory committee similar to that which has functioned under the REAP and Waterbank program should be established in each state.

He concluded by requesting each state to continue work on the farm programs committee and stating that the set-aside acres survey conducted in 1972 will be repeated in 1973 with emphasis on documenting erosion problems on this land.

Richard Nomsen (Iowa Conservation Commission) reported on his trip in February to Washington, D.C., as a representative of the North Central Section of the Wildlife Society, to put forth the views of that organization on the future direction of federal farm programs. These are essentially similar to those expressed by Mr. Nelson. Mr. Nomsen attended the House floor debates on the status of the REAP program. It was evident to him that much more work is needed on the individual state level to make lawmakers aware of the desires of wildlife people — such was almost totally lacking in the session he attended. He pointed out that more money was spent for "family gardens" under the REAP program than was spent for wildlife food plots or wetlands. He stressed that should the REAP program be continued in some form, it should aim at providing benefits to all people, not just landowners and tenants.

Dr. Ronald Labisky (Illinois Natural History Survey) was unable to get to the meeting to present his report on the accomplishments and activities of the Agricultural Programs Committee of the Midwest Pheasant Council. His prepared report reviewed the background of cropland diversion and discussed in some detail the current "set-aside" program and the urgent need for modifications in the next farm bill. He pointed out that no species of wildlife in the United States is more closely related to agriculture than the pheasant, and that pheasant abundance is related directly to the amount of available safe nesting cover — principally undisturbed perennial grasses and legumes. In the past decade, the acreage of such cover has declined drastically as more land has been devoted to the production of feed grains and wheat. Wherever this has happened, pheasant populations have likewise declined. Long-term investigations of pheasant populations in Illinois, Iowa, Nebraska and South Dakota show that a doubling of perennial cover acreage, which could be achieved through modifications in farm program diverted acres, would result in a doubling of pheasant abundance.

Not only would such an increase in pheasants provide millions of days of recreation to the public, but it would also have significant economic impact. A survey conducted

by this committee showed that pheasant hunting is a big business. Costs to bag a pheasant in 1971 averaged \$18.34 for resident hunters and \$22.61 for non-resident hunters. The current U.S. harvest of pheasants totals about 12 million birds. Present revenues derived from pheasant hunting, exclusive of license fees, total about \$225 million annually. Double the pheasant flock, and pheasant hunting would then contribute close to a half-billion dollars annually.

The Tuesday afternoon program featured a discussion of "Operation Pheasant in Minnesota" by Tom Isely (Minnesota DNR). In 1970 the legislature appropriated money to develop pheasant habitat. As a result a project to develop winter and nesting cover in south central Minnesota was initiated. Nesting cover was established at a cost of \$18 per acre, food plots for \$40 per acre, and woody cover for \$500 per plot. Methods for scientifically evaluating the results of this program were designed into the project, but it is too early to make any conclusions as yet. Nearly all of the development was on "set-aside" acres because of the high cost of leasing land. A general survey within the study area indicated 10 per cent of the landowners had a genuine interest in wildlife and might develop habitat on their own, 10 per cent was against wildlife and 80 per cent would develop habitat for a price. The most common reason for not going into the habitat program was they wished to rotate their crops and not set aside a plot of ground for any length of time. Current problems in the program are: a desire to harvest food plots, too little cover too far apart, weed control problem, private landowner does a poor job on woody cover planting and maintenance, lack of farmer interest, need for a long-term land retirement program and the uncertainty of the current set-aside program, and no REAP cost sharing for the current year. Wednesday afternoon was spent touring a portion of the area involved in the "Operation Pheasant" project.

Garry Garrison (Washington State Department of Game) reviewed Washington's history of pheasant management from their first stocking in the state in 1883 through to the present. Currently eight game farms are operated producing approximately 100,000 pheasants. They also provide over 34,000 day-old chicks and 12,000 eggs to individuals who wish to raise pheasants for release into the wild. Current costs vary from \$3.50 to \$4.50 per cock pheasant released before the gun. Washington developed a feel-free-to-hunt program by providing signs stating such and then guaranteed enforcement of rules and regulations on these lands. Annually, 180,000 acres are open to public hunting through this program at a cost of about 10 cents an acre. The most current research work has been an evaluation of pheasant

losses occurring from early harvesting of alfalfa. The machine used to cut alfalfa is the swather, which operates at high speed, and 68.8 per cent of the hens were killed from incubating nests. Projected losses of young pheasants is placed at 190,156. This prompted a request for the Pheasant Council to develop a resolution to point out the major wildlife losses due to farm machinery and seek aid from the manufacturers in developing safeguards on high moving equipment.

Gerald Cross (North Dakota State University) presented the final paper of the afternoon on work being done to evaluate land use changes soon to be effected by the Garrison Diversion irrigation project. The study area contains considerable idle ground with good cover and a high water table. The areas were completely cover mapped each year with pheasant crowing counts conducted. There was a significant difference between pheasant numbers between study areas. Statistically analysis was not able to determine the cover types responsible for the variations between the pheasant populations. Possibly the population level was too low to be affected by habitat.

A session on predator-pheasant relationships was begun by Carl Trautman's discussion of the comprehensive South Dakota predator study. This was begun in 1964 to evaluate the effects on pheasant populations from predator control programs. Controlling fox only had little effect, but controlling skunks, raccoon and badger as well did result in significant pheasant population increases. Sizeable populations of small carnivores have developed in the state with the removal of their predator species, as a result of changes in the "balance of nature" brought on by man. This leaves man as essentially the only means left to control these small carnivores. A landowner survey in South Dakota indicated 98 per cent of the farmers wanted some control of small carnivores, over 50 percent wanted intensive controls, and only 16 per cent would carry out control measures by themselves. It has been concluded that if the entire state pheasant range were intensively controlled for small carnivores, the state pheasant population would triple. The estimated cost is \$42 per section, which would have to be made up for by the increase in non-resident license money generated by the increase in pheasants.

Harold Duebbert (BSFWS-NPWRC-Jamestown, North Dakota) reported on his waterfowl nesting studies on CAP land within the South Dakota predator study area. He found that nesting densities were greatly increased when heavy residual cover was present in early spring. Reduced predation increased nesting success. Favored nesting vegetation was tall wheat grass, intermediate wheat grass and alfalfa. Pheasants will show similar response on such CAP lands.

A report submitted by C. M. Pils (Wisconsin DNR) summarized the predator-pheasant aspects of the long term experimental farm game habitat management study on the Waterloo Wildlife Area. The original goal of this study was to increase pheasant harvest on the area by 50 per cent. Over 200 pheasants were radio-equipped and the eventual fate of half of these was determined. Results indicated that predation was the primary factor limiting pheasant abundance on this area (one with very good cover), accounting for over 80 per cent of known causes of death. Mammalian predation was most important - nearly 50 per cent of known causes - with foxes the main culprit. Earlier Wisconsin studies concluded that predation was most likely to influence pheasant population levels in marginal range, but the current results indicate predation can be a limiting factor in areas of good pheasant range, especially on an area where additional effort has been made to further improve habitat quality. Additional investigations into the effects of foxes and raptors on pheasant, rabbit and small mammal populations in southern Wisconsin are now in progress. Early results indicate that all three categories are important food items of foxes. If predation is proved to be the limiting factor, a red fox and raptor reduction effort will be made in 1974-76 on the Waterloo Study Area. The effects of such a program will be analyzed by monitoring pheasant, cottontail and small mammal populations.

Another facet of the same Wisconsin investigations was discussed in a report submitted by Robert Dumke (Wisconsin DNR) on the influence of weather on predation levels. Predation was important throughout the year, but was of special significance during periods of snow cover (December 15 - February 18) and nesting (April 15 - June 28). Fall to spring mortality was high during years with severe winter weather, and likewise, the frequency of occurrence of pheasant in fox stomachs increased in those years. It appeared the accelerated rate of mortality during the period of snow cover was largely a function of predation. Availability of rodents, the usual mainstay of the predator's diet, is decreased by the snow cover. Predators must turn to other sources of food, and the pheasant is one of the candidates. There was also an indication that there may be a positive relationship between precipitation and predation during the nesting period. More research is needed to clarify the importance of weather factors on predation, particularly during periods other than snow cover.

On Wednesday evening, a discussion covering future management of the pheasant was held. Considerable time was spent on the pros and cons of State-operated put-and-take pheasant hunting areas. Two papers on the scheduled program dealt with this subject. The McGraw Wildlife Foundation

(Illinois) has made field performance tests of two pheasant strains for put-and-take hunting. The Korean pheasant proved too wild to be feasible for most game breeders (not economically possible to produce large enough numbers in pens), so a "Korean-cross" (between pure Korean and McGraw game farm birds) was tested against the regular "McGraw ringnecks." It was found that the Korean-crosses showed similar flushing behavior, but were flushed and killed at lower rates. The subjective conclusion of observers was that they were a warier, "sneakier" bird. Thus they showed some qualities not highly desirable in a shooting preserve pheasant. There is some question whether long term survival and subsequent production of the unharvested portion of the released birds was any better with the Korean-crosses than the game farm birds. The small sample involved in this study did not show any difference, but more extensive work at Nilo Farms indicates the Korean-crosses have done much better in terms of post-release survival and reproduction.

A report on harvest rates of stocked pheasants on the Waterloo Wildlife Area in Wisconsin was submitted by Gene Woehler (Wisconsin DNR). Artificial propagation and stocking of ringnecks has been a permanent fixture in Wisconsin's game management program since 1928. Annual releases in that 44-year period have totaled in excess of 500,000 birds, though populations of wild pheasants have been relatively stable. Pre- and mid-season releases of game farm stock on State wildlife areas have provided thousands of hunters a reasonable recreational opportunity that may be limited elsewhere on private lands. Ringneck roosters were released on the Waterloo Area 3 days before the season and on the 6th and 13th days of the season, with some variations (season length during the study period varied from 37 to 44 days, but around 90 per cent of the hunting pressure and 95 per cent of the harvest takes place during the first 16 days). The stocked roosters were more vulnerable to the gun than wild birds - 75 per cent of the pre-season release was taken the first 2 days of the season. The same was true for the other two releases (big increase the first 2 days). Wild birds follow a similar kill pattern, but the distribution is much better throughout the season. Lumping the three releases together showed that 10 - 20 hours was necessary, on the average, to bag a stocked rooster during any of the first 16 days of the season. Mid-season releases showed the highest rate of recovery - up to 90 per cent from some release points -- due to immediate exposure to the gun.

In conclusion, I wish on behalf of the Midwest Pheasant Council to thank the Midwest Association of Fish and Game Commissioners for supporting the Council during its 16 years of existence. The benefits gained by the many individuals

involved in pheasant research and management in the several states and provinces involved would be hard to measure. There are primarily "field level" people who often have little opportunity, other than through the Pheasant Council, to meet and exchange research findings, management evaluations, and ideas for future approaches to the many problems that exist. The meetings have now "gone the round" of all member States. It had been the hope of the Chairman to have an in-depth discussion of the future direction and goals of the Council, with particular view toward changes that might be recommended for the parent organization consideration (per Resolution 19 of last year). This was "grounded" by the snowstorm that prevented many of us from attending. We believe that the Midwest Pheasant Council serves a valuable function. We also recognize there is always room for improvement, and thus will be awaiting the recommendations from the Association.

* * *

III

1973 RESOLUTIONS

ASSOCIATION OF MIDWEST FISH AND WILDLIFE COMMISSIONERS

1. Federal Water Project Recreation Act
2. U.S.F.S. Funding for Multiple Use Management
3. Extension of the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act
4. State Agency Participation in the National Environmental Policy Act
5. Commending Keith Harmon and Maynard Nelson
6. Hunting Season on Canvasback and Redhead Ducks
7. Commercial Fishing
8. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and State Cooperative Programs
9. Federal Cropland Diversion Programs
10. Request for Congressional Hearings Regarding the Dredge Spoil Deposition Problem on Upper Missouri River by the U. S. Corps of Engineers
11. Funding of Sea Lamprey Control Program, by 1975
12. International Waterfowl Management Symposium
13. Support for Arkansas in Challenging the Federal Cache River Drainage Project
14. Restoration of Funds for REAP, Water Bank, and LAWCON Programs
15. Stream Alteration Programs
16. Depredation Problem Study
17. Federal Funding for Seasonal Employment of Students in Conservation Work
18. Opposition to Trout Unlimited
19. The YWCA Position on Guns
20. Concern for the Federal Wetlands Program
21. North American Wildlife Policy
22. Commending Senators for their Agricultural Bill Efforts
23. Appreciation for North Dakota's Hospitality and Good Program

FEDERAL WATER PROJECT RECREATION ACT

WHEREAS, no action has been taken regarding previous resolutions pertaining to modification of the Federal Water Project Recreation Act submitted in the 1971 annual meeting of the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners; and

WHEREAS, the Act (P.L. 89-72) requires that full consideration be given to recreation enhancement as a purpose of federal water projects; and

WHEREAS, the Act further provides that a non-federal public body must 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 plus at least one-half of all construction costs and project modifications, including water for a recreation pool and evaporative loss, 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 funds to meet cost-sharing obligations;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners, meeting in Bismarck, North Dakota, July 19, 1973, reaffirm the recommendation that the Federal Water Project Recreation Act (P.L. 89-72) be repealed or amended to make costs of facilities for anadromous fish, migratory waterfowl, endangered species and estuarine resources nonreimbursable, also for water control, storage and control facilities; eliminate the \$28 million limit on land purchased for waterfowl as part of water projects; ensure separable costs of basic access, sanitary and safety facilities would be federal costs; ensure that fish and wildlife losses be satisfactorily compensated before enhancement features are cost-shared; and ensure that the interest requirement be waived on cost-share repayments; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, members of Congress, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Defense, and to the Chairman of the Coordinating Committee of the Water Resources Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 2

U.S.F.S. FUNDING FOR MULTIPLE USE MANAGEMENT

WHEREAS, the U.S. Forest Service by Congressional decree is directed to manage the forests under a multiple use concept; and

WHEREAS, the modern use of forests creates demands for recreational hunting, hiking, and camping with economic potential at the levels comparable to traditional wood forest production; and

WHEREAS, natural growth patterns in national forests have lowered the wildlife production in much of the forested lands; and

WHEREAS, the traditional forestry concepts of conversion of intolerant forest types to tolerant species for sawlog production has had a deleterious effect on deer and other wildlife populations in most areas of the national forests; and

WHEREAS, the budgetary consideration in Forest Service appropriations has always favored timber production because it is felt that this is the only feature of forest management that gives a monetary return to the Government, which is a philosophy akin to trying to run the U.S. Navy at a profit;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners, meeting in Bismarck, North Dakota, July 19, 1973, strongly urge the Congress and associated fiscal agencies to provide a realistic multiple use budget which will recognize wildlife management and provide funds for an adequate program in this sphere of activity.

RESOLUTION NO. 3

EXTENSION OF THE ANADROMOUS FISH CONSERVATION ACT

WHEREAS, the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act, PL 89-304, PL 91-249, which provides the financial assistance necessary to rebuild the anadromous fishery resources of the United States through support of new hatchery facilities and enhancement of stream conditions, including spawning areas, expires June 30, 1974; and

WHEREAS, the application of this program in the Great Lakes has materially helped to establish large populations of steelhead, brown trout, coho, chinook salmon, and other species which provide millions of recreation days and economic benefits to the Great Lakes areas; and

WHEREAS, favorable conditions for Great Lakes anadromous fish result from the coordinated efforts and programs conducted by the Great Lakes Fishery Commission, the Great Lakes Fishery Laboratory, eight Great Lakes States, the Province of Ontario, and federal governments of Canada and the United States in the control of sea lamprey; and

WHEREAS, the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners has actively supported the Anadromous Fish Program for several years and sees the need for its being continued;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners, meeting in Bismarck, North Dakota, July 19, 1973, express appreciation to the Congress of the United States for efforts to rebuild the Nation's fishery through the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act (PL 91-249), and urge the Congress to enact H.R. 6396 or similar legislation to extend the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act to include (1) extension of the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act to June 30, 1979; (2) authorization and appropriation of \$10 million per annum, which in part will support Great Lakes States' programs to carry out provisions of the Act; (3) provision to permit utilization of funds for barrier construction for sea lamprey control in the Great Lakes; and (4) 75% federal funding when joint projects involve two or more States.

RESOLUTION NO. 4

STATE AGENCY PARTICIPATION IN
THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT

WHEREAS, Congress recognizes the profound impact of Man's activities on the interrelationship of all components of the natural environment; and

WHEREAS, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA - PL 91-190) declares a policy to provide efforts which will prevent or eliminate damage to the environment and stimulate the health and welfare of Man; and

WHEREAS, provisions of NEPA require all federal agencies to utilize a systematic interdisciplinary approach to evaluate environmental impacts and to prepare environmental impact statements on major actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment; and

WHEREAS, prior to making any detailed environmental impact statement, federal agencies must seek the comments and views of appropriate state agencies; and

WHEREAS, NEPA has placed new and increased responsibilities on state agencies without compensation to carry out the spirit and intent of the law;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners, meeting in Bismarck, North Dakota, July 19, 1973, recommend that Congress provide sufficient funds for state agencies to fully participate in these new and important interagency decision-making activities as required by NEPA.

RESOLUTION NO. 5

COMMENDING KEITH HARMON AND MAYNARD NELSON

WHEREAS, farm game species have declined in numbers due to intensive agricultural practices; and

WHEREAS, the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources and the Wildlife Management Institute realized the potential of the federal land retirement programs for providing the habitat needed to bolster game populations, and provided the money and personnel for necessary leadership required to develop a program to recommend modifications in the federal Farm Program; and

WHEREAS, Maynard Nelson of the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources and Keith Harmon of the Wildlife Management Institute did provide such leadership to the Farm Program Committee with membership from 13 States, and were dedicated to the cause of establishing cover to protect our soils and provide cover for wildlife on set-aside acres;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners, meeting in Bismarck, North Dakota, July 19, 1973, express its appreciation to the Wildlife Management Institute and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, and specifically to Keith Harmon and Maynard Nelson, for their outstanding and devoted leadership in coordinating activities of the Farm Program Committee and Congressional liaison necessary to effect changes in agricultural legislation to insure establishment of perennial cover on set-aside acres for conservation of our soils and provision of much-needed habitat for farm game.

RESOLUTION NO. 6

HUNTING SEASON ON CANVASBACK AND REDHEAD DUCKS

WHEREAS, the 1972 closed season on canvasbacks and redheads was an unsatisfactory regulation and did not accomplish the desired results; and

WHEREAS, such closure destroys the point system concept, encourages wanton waste of waterfowl, and causes the public to question the wisdom of those who establish such conflicting regulations; and

WHEREAS, the objective of reducing the harvest of canvasbacks and redheads was achieved with the very restrictive regulations of the previous three years;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners, meeting in Bismarck, North Dakota, July 19, 1973, request that an open season be permitted on canvasbacks and redheads in 1973 with the following restrictions:

- (1) that one redhead or one canvasback be permitted in the regular daily bag and possession limit; and
- (2) that maximum point values be assigned to redheads and canvasbacks with a possession limit of one redhead or one canvasback in the point system bag limit; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, as the National Canvasback and Redheads Committee recommendations did not have full committee support in 1972, a majority and minority report be made available to all member States; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Director of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and to the chairmen of the four Flyway Councils.

RESOLUTION NO. 7

COMMERCIAL FISHING

WHEREAS, many of the continent's commercial fishery resources have undergone a long and continued history of biological and economic decline in response to the combined efforts imposed by fish introductions, environmental degradation, and excessive exploitation in both fresh and marine waters; and

WHEREAS, many species have been stressed to the point of extinction or remnant population; and

WHEREAS, these stresses have impacted some of the most valuable food fisheries of the oceans and coregonid species in the Great Lakes; and

WHEREAS, the common property concept has allowed free and open entry into the continent's commercial fisheries, largely unrestricted as to the amount of fish that could be taken; and

WHEREAS, the ownership of all fish is clearly established as a public trust in the inland waters including the Great Lakes, and should be so established in coastal marine waters;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners, meeting in Bismarck, North Dakota, July 19, 1973:

- (1) refutes the common property concept of the commercial fisheries, endorsing a limited entry fishery that operates on the basis of quotas for harvestable stocks, and
 - (2) endorses and urges acceleration of the planned programs of the International Joint Commission designed to recover quality fish habitat, and
 - (3) wishes to consider and comment upon engineering developmental works proposed, in light of possibilities that they may provide access for invasion by non-native species;
- and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that each State and Province holding jurisdiction over the fish in its waters, and the Federal Government in coastal waters, adopt a policy to assure the development of a system of yields that will guarantee maximum public benefits incorporating both sport fishing and commercial food fishing values.

RESOLUTION NO. 8

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE
AND STATE COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS

WHEREAS, the demands for protection and enhancement of our nation's fish and wildlife resources far surpasses the funding limitations at both the state and federal levels; and

WHEREAS, the independent resources and technical capabilities of state and federal agencies concerned with fish and wildlife management and research can be more effectively combined to obtain the best return for the conservation dollar; and

WHEREAS, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife has outlined a number of suggested programs where new federal-state cooperative efforts might be initiated in the areas of hatchery and refuge operations, fish and wildlife research, and joint river basin study units;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners, meeting in Bismarck, North Dakota, July 19, 1973, applaud the efforts of the Director of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife to enhance federal-state cooperative activities and endorse the concepts presented to the Executive Committee of the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners in February 1973 and recently forwarded to the States; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that States be urged to carefully review these proposals and suggest pilot cooperative projects as the first stage of implementation.

RESOLUTION NO. 9

FEDERAL CROPLAND DIVERSION PROGRAMS

WHEREAS, the USDA's cropland diversion programs, administered by the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, have been established to curtail the excessive production of certain farm commodities, thereby assuring the producer an available market and an equitable price for his product; and

WHEREAS, in 1972 the acreage of land in the U.S. that was diverted from the production of wheat, feed grains, and cotton under the set-aside program totaled 59.6 million acres; and

WHEREAS, the lands diverted from crop production are being administered principally on an annual basis, and consequently are often fallowed or left barren of vegetation for most - and sometimes all - of the year, such as in 1972 when 57 percent of the total set-aside acreage in 13 Midwestern states was not even seeded to a vegetative cover crop; and

WHEREAS, the practice of leaving soils unprotected is environmentally degrading; the erosion of unprotected soils by wind and water depletes soil productivity, accelerates the loss of essential nutrients, and aggravates problems of air and water pollution; and, also, idle croplands that are devoid of vegetative cover offer little or no habitat for wildlife, thereby reducing the recreational potential of our lands at a time when needs for such are expanding rapidly; and

WHEREAS, these cropland diversion programs could, however, with minor non-cost modifications, yield substantial environmental benefits;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners, meeting in Bismarck, North Dakota, July 19, 1973, declare its policy to support legislation for cropland diversion programs provided that such legislation

- (1) insures that all croplands diverted from production are devoted to protective cover crops that will safeguard air, water, soil and wildlife, and
- (2) encourages that the maximum acreage of cropland diverted from production be administered under multi-year contracts for the duration of the 1973 Farm Program, and that it be devoted to a self-maintaining vegetative crop.

RESOLUTION NO. 10

REQUEST FOR CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS REGARDING THE DREDGE
SPOIL DEPOSITION PROBLEM ON UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER
BY THE U.S. CORPS OF ENGINEERS

WHEREAS, the Mississippi River is a very important fish and wildlife and recreational area, and dredge spoil operations by the U.S. Corps of Engineers in connection with maintaining the 9-foot channel continue to degrade it; and

WHEREAS, during the 35 years of channel maintenance on the upper river, 40 percent of the flood plain has been covered with sand, and acceptable spoil areas are critical; and

WHEREAS, the threat of this scenic river being converted to a barge canal among sand piles is rapidly becoming reality, and concerned resource agencies are calling for reappraisal of priorities for river use; and

WHEREAS, a recent survey by the U.S. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife delineates 126 areas totaling 37.8 miles of degraded or destroyed habitat along the Mississippi channel; and

WHEREAS, these operations can be expected to continue unless new courses of action are adopted by governmental agencies;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners, meeting in Bismarck, North Dakota, July 19, 1973, urge that Congressional hearings be held soon to review dredge spoil problems on the Mississippi River and to consider all modes of transportation and relative costs, and that the respective State governments petition the Upper Mississippi River Basin Commission to initiate such hearings.

RESOLUTION NO. 11

FUNDING OF SEA LAMPREY CONTROL PROGRAM, BY 1975

WHEREAS, the control of sea lamprey is an essential requirement for the restoration of the fisheries in the Great Lakes; and

WHEREAS, the Great Lakes Fishery Commission's program to control the sea lamprey by periodic treatment of lamprey infested streams has been outstandingly successful in the upper lakes - reducing lamprey abundance by nearly 90 percent in Lakes Superior, Michigan and Huron; and

WHEREAS, the extension of sea lamprey control to Lake Ontario in 1971 should bring similar reduction in lamprey abundance by 1974; and

WHEREAS, the control of sea lamprey and successful intensive planting of hatchery-reared trout and salmon in the upper lakes have been responsible for the establishment of the most dramatic sport fishery in the history of the Great Lakes; and

WHEREAS, the extension of sea lamprey control to all four of the lamprey-infested Great Lakes has increased requirements for personnel and funds for surveillance and treatment of lamprey-producing areas; and

WHEREAS, the persistence of lamprey wounding on the valuable trout in some areas of Lakes Superior, Michigan and Huron dictate that intensification of lamprey control in the upper lakes is essential; and

WHEREAS, the Great Lakes Fishery Commission has established a budget requirement in FY 1975 of \$3,732,545.00, of which the U.S. share is \$2,554,900.00, to support intensification of sea lamprey control in the upper lakes, to maintain sea lamprey control in Lake Ontario, to develop permanent lamprey barriers as an integrated segment of lamprey control, to continue research - particularly the feasibility of biological control, and to continue studies required by the EPA for the Great Lakes Fishery Commission to continue the judicious use of lampricides in the aquatic environment;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners, meeting in Bismarck, North Dakota, July 19, 1973, recommend that the President's budget for FY 1975 include \$2,554,900.00 as the U.S. contribution to the Great Lakes Fishery Commission's sea lamprey control program; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Conference of Great Lakes Senators and Congressmen so that they may be apprised of the sea lamprey control program and support the budget requirement of the Great Lakes Fishery Commission for the further reduction of the sea lamprey in the waters of the Great Lakes.

RESOLUTION NO. 12

INTERNATIONAL WATERFOWL MANAGEMENT SYMPOSIUM

WHEREAS, waterfowl hunters of the continent seldom have opportunity to gain firsthand information on waterfowl management programs; and

WHEREAS, Ducks Unlimited, Inc., is interested in developing informational programs for hunters;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners, meeting in Bismarck, North Dakota, July 19, 1973, endorse and support a plan to establish an international waterfowl management symposium to be developed by Ducks Unlimited, Inc.; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this resolution be submitted to the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners for consideration at its annual meeting in September of 1973.

RESOLUTION NO. 13

SUPPORT FOR ARKANSAS IN CHALLENGING
THE FEDERAL CACHE RIVER DRAINAGE PROJECT

WHEREAS, plans for the Cache River drainage project in northeastern Arkansas designed by the U.S. Corps of Engineers will destroy thousands of acres of prime habitat used by waterfowl, particularly wintering mallards, and other wildlife; and

WHEREAS, the population of mallards and other ducks in the Mississippi Valley Flyway and resident wildlife species will be seriously reduced if the Cache River channelization project is carried out as planned by the Corps;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners, meeting in Bismarck, North Dakota, July 19, 1973, oppose the Cache River channelization project; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the various governmental agencies involved be notified of the Association's action.

RESOLUTION NO. 14

RESTORATION OF FUNDS FOR REAP,
WATER BANK, AND LAWCON PROGRAMS

WHEREAS, the federal impoundment of funds for REAP, Water Bank, and LAWCON programs has had an adverse effect on important natural resource programs in the Midwest and throughout the United States;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners, meeting in Bismarck, North Dakota, July 19, 1973, urge the President's Office to release funds for these important resource programs.

RESOLUTION NO. 15

STREAM ALTERATION PROGRAMS

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 wildlife habitat; and

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

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

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners, meeting in Bismarck, North Dakota, July 19, 1973, vigorously oppose publicly funded stream alteration programs except in those instances where human life is affected or where there are no significant adverse effects upon fish and wildlife and no other feasible alternatives are available; and, further provided that, in those cases where stream alteration projects meet the above criteria, construction should not be permitted to proceed until natural resource values and recreational opportunities are comprehensively evaluated and recommendations for resource compensation are included as an integral part of the project and project cost; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Association encourage and support administrative directives and legislative programs which will ensure the protection and enhancement of fish and wildlife resources; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this resolution be sent to the Director of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Defense, and to Governors of the states.

RESOLUTION NO. 16

DEPREDATION PROBLEM STUDY

WHEREAS, crop depredation by wildlife has never been given the proper amount of consideration that the problem warrants; and

WHEREAS, the increase of grain prices has increased the concern of farmers about losses of crops to wildlife, and more especially to migratory birds; and

WHEREAS, there has never been a detailed study of the problem in the conterminous forty-eight states;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners, meeting in Bismarck, North Dakota, July 19, 1973, urge that the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife begin a detailed study of the depredation problem caused by migratory birds in early fiscal year 1974; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, after learning the magnitude of the problem, the Bureau be urged to draft a practical list of solutions to the problem for submission to the several States for their consideration.

RESOLUTION NO. 17

FEDERAL FUNDING FOR SEASONAL EMPLOYMENT
OF STUDENTS IN CONSERVATION WORK

WHEREAS, conservation agencies have numerous opportunities for seasonal employment of college and late high school students; and

WHEREAS, young people are chronically faced with underemployment or unemployment during the summer season; and

WHEREAS, providing these opportunities is dependent upon the availability of funds; and

WHEREAS, the availability of such funds has been much reduced as a result of cutback of student and work (study) funds;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners, meeting in Bismarck, North Dakota, July 19, 1973, support legislation which will strengthen and properly fund

- (1) the Environmental Quality Corps Act of 1973,
- (2) the Youth Conservation Corps, and
- (3) the Environmental Education Act; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this resolution be forwarded to members of Congress, the President, and administrators of the programs.

OPPOSITION TO TROUT UNLIMITED

WHEREAS, R. P. Gytenbeek, Executive Director of Trout Unlimited, has written to Commissioners of the Colorado Division of Wildlife as follows:

"In thinking about the vacancy in Game and Fish, it occurs to me that it's time Colorado took a bold step in this area. After over four years of dealing with the Fish and Game Departments of this country, in addition to federal agencies involved with the same problems, it's crystal clear that what we don't need at the head of a department of this type is a professional fisheries or wildlife man. Instead, we need a professional manager. If ever there is a place in the structure of this country where the Peter Principle applies it is in these departments. Extremely competent division managers in game or fish are invariably promoted to the position of head of the department and have, thus, risen to their level of incompetence.

"As I see it, the gut necessity for running a department of this type is a professional manager. He must be able to speak well on his feet, be a good politician and be able to create esprit de corps in addition to effectively accomplishing supervision over personnel, fiscal matters and all the other many facets of running a business.

"For this reason, I hope that Colorado will take the bold step of getting away from the tradition bound methodology for finding a head for our department. Forget the technical fisheries and wildlife professionals and find, instead, a first rate corporate manager.

"I would appreciate your thoughts and response to my suggestion as our people across the state are most interested and concerned with the eventual selection."

and

WHEREAS, this recommendation is an insult to the administrative and conservation ability and leadership of most past and present game and fish directors and conservation commissioners;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners, meeting in Bismarck, North Dakota, July 19, 1973, communicate to the Colorado State Personnel Board, the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners, and the Directors of Trout Unlimited our complete resentment with this recommendation.

RESOLUTION NO. 19

THE YWCA POSITION ON GUNS

WHEREAS, the YWCA National Delegate Assembly, in March 1973 in San Diego, adopted a resolution calling for a complete registration of all firearms and firearms supplies, and the banning of all handguns; and

WHEREAS, federal tax on guns and ammunition is used for wildlife conservation, preservation and management; and

WHEREAS, the state fish and wildlife agencies are funded from hunting and fishing licenses; and

WHEREAS, the registration of sporting guns would have a great effect on the sport of hunting by the reduction of hunting fees and taxes; and

WHEREAS, the YWCA is partially funded by the United Fund;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners, meeting in Bismarck, North Dakota, July 19, 1973, recommend to Association members and their agencies, conservation clubs and other groups interested in the wise use of wildlife resources, not to contribute to United Fund or to any fund from which money is received by the YWCA; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this resolution be sent to the National YWCA, United Fund, and to each state YWCA and United Fund.

RESOLUTION NO. 20

CONCERN FOR THE
FEDERAL WETLANDS PROGRAM

WHEREAS, the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners, based on information available, is of the opinion that the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife is de-emphasizing the Small Wetland Acquisition and Easement Program; and

WHEREAS, it appears that the original goals will not be met; and

WHEREAS, the level of funding has been reduced to about one-half; and

WHEREAS, the Bureau made a field evaluation of the wetlands program over a year ago, and the report has not been made available to the States for review;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners, meeting in Bismarck, North Dakota, July 19, 1973, urge that the Bureau assign top priority to the Wetlands program by doing the following:

- (1) work in cooperation with the States to increase the present level of funding,
- (2) increase the wetland staff in the field,
- (3) conduct a more detailed wetland inventory, and
- (4) in cooperation with the States, begin working toward an extension of the Program beyond 1976; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Bureau and to Congressmen Dingell and Reuss and Senator Humphrey, and that the respective States bring this matter to the attention of their Congressional delegation.

RESOLUTION NO. 21

NORTH AMERICAN WILDLIFE POLICY

WHEREAS, an ad hoc committee was created in 1972 to revise and update the American Game Policy; and

WHEREAS, a new and longer policy, known as the North American Wildlife Policy, was created by this distinguished committee; and

WHEREAS, a report was given and this new policy first revealed at the North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference in 1973 with no obvious action taken to accept, approve or negate; and

WHEREAS, this policy could and should provide guidance and basis for wildlife management decisions and actions internationally for several decades;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners, meeting in Bismarck, North Dakota, July 19, 1973, go on record with the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners to request that the committee complete its charge by recommending positive actions and guidelines, within a suitable time frame, to resolve the problems outlined in the aforementioned document.

RESOLUTION NO. 22

COMMENDING SENATORS FOR
THEIR AGRICULTURAL BILL EFFORTS

WHEREAS, the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners passed Resolution No. 7 during its 1972 annual meeting, urging Congress to incorporate changes in the USDA land retirement programs to protect soil and wildlife resources; and

WHEREAS, many State conservation and natural resource departments, a 13-State Farm Program Committee, the Midwest Pheasant Council, and several State and regional chapters of The Wildlife Society have actively supported these changes in the farmland retirement programs; and

WHEREAS, Senator Humphrey of Minnesota and Senators Eastland (Miss.), Curtis (Neb.), McGovern (S.D.), Young (N.D.), Allen (Ala.), Dole (Ks.), Huddleston (Ky.), Bellmon (Okla.), Clark (Ia.), Helms (N.C.), Abourezk (S.D.), Mondale (Mn.), and Nelson (Wisc.) have incorporated these recommended changes into Amendment No. 197 to the proposed Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973; and

WHEREAS, these Senators guided this amendment to successful passage through the Senate of the United States;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners, meeting in Bismarck, North Dakota, July 19, 1973, commend Senators Humphrey, Eastland, Curtis, McGovern, Young, Allen, Dole, Huddleston, Bellmon, Clark, Helms, Abourezk, Mondale and Nelson for their efforts in preparing, sponsoring, and guiding this amendment through the Senate; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to these Senators and to the Chairman of the Agriculture Committee of the House of Representatives.

RESOLUTION NO. 23

APPRECIATION FOR
NORTH DAKOTA'S HOSPITALITY
AND GOOD PROGRAM

WHEREAS, the North Dakota Game and Fish Department has provided an excellent program and fine accommodations for the 40th annual meeting of the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners; and

WHEREAS, all delegates and guests are most appreciative of the hospitality and courtesy extended by our hosts;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners, meeting in Bismarck, North Dakota, July 19, 1973, express its gratitude and appreciation to the State of North Dakota and its Game and Fish Department, and its special appreciation to Commissioner Russell Stuart and his entire staff that made the 40th annual meeting so successful.

- Registration -

40TH ANNUAL CONVENTION

Donald T. Aho - U.S. Soil Conservation Service, Bismarck ND
Stephen Allen - N.D. Game & Fish Department, Bismarck ND
Dan C. Armbruster - Ohio Division of Wildlife, Columbus, OH
Wm. Aultfather - U.S. Bureau of Sport Fisheries & Wildlife,
Twin Cities, Minn.

George G.P. Bekeris - B.S.F.W., Twin Cities, Minn.
Willard R. Barbee - Neb. Game & Parks Comm., Lincoln, NB
Harold Bellin - N.D. Game & Fish Dept., LaMoure, ND
Harold M. Boeker - B.S.F.W., Lakewood, Colorado
Wilbur Boldt - N.D. Game & Fish Dept., Bismarck, ND
Edwin Bry - N.D. Game & Fish Dept., Bismarck, ND
Pershing Carlson - N.D. Game & Fish Dept., Bismarck, ND
Floyd Chrest - N.D. Game & Fish Dept., Washburn, ND
Jerry M. Conley - Iowa Conservation Comm., Indianola, Iowa
Ben Dekker - N.D. Game & Fish Dept., Watford City, ND
George Dellinger - Missouri Dept. of Conservation,
Jefferson City, Missouri

John W. Ellis - B.S.F.W., Twin Cities, Minn.
Bob Evans - Colorado Division of Wildlife, Arvada, CO
Mardell Flaten - N.D. Game & Fish Dept., Mandan, ND
Edward J. Frank - Wisconsin Dept. of Natural Resources,
Madison, WI

Robert E. Freeman - B.S.F.W., Bismarck, ND
A. Gene Gazlay - Michigan Dept. of Natural Resources,
Okemos, MI

Lyle J. Geissinger - U.S. Corps of Engineers, Riverdale, ND
Richard C. Goulden - Manitoba Dept. of Mines, Resources &
Environmental Mgt., Winnipeg, Man.

Chuck Griffith - National Wildlife Fed., Minneapolis, MN
Levon Grinde - N.D. Game & Fish Dept., Cando, ND
James C. Gritman - B.S.F.W., Bismarck, ND
C. R. Grondahl - N.D. Game & Fish Dept., Bismarck, ND
Jack D. Haley - Kansas Forestry, Fish & Game Comm.,
Minneapolis, KS

Charles D. Harris - Mich. Dept. of Natural Resources,
Lansing, MI

Keith W. Harmon - Wildlife Mgt. Institute, Fargo, ND
Dale L. Henegar - N.D. Game & Fish Dept., Bismarck, ND
Robert L. Herbst - Minnesota Dept. of Natural Resources,
St. Paul, MN

Bob Hodgins - B.S.F.W., Twin Cities, MN
A. C. Hoefelman - Mo. Dept. of Conservation, Jefferson City
Bob Hoover - Colorado Div. of Wildlife, Denver, CO
Charles A. Hughlett - B.S.F.W., Minneapolis, Mn
Ken Irizawa - Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources,
Toronto, Ont.

Gail James - N.D. Game & Fish Dept., Bismarck, ND
George Jankowski - N.D. Game & Fish Dept., Bowman, ND

David Jensen - N.D. Game & Fish Dept., Bismarck, ND
Donald R. Johnston - Ont. Ministry of Nat. Res., Toronto, Ont.
George Karpen - N.D. Game & Fish Dept., Carrington, ND
Kent Klepinger - Wisc. Dept. of Nat. Resources, Madison, WI
Ed Kozicky - Winchester-Western, Olin Corp., E. Alton, IL
C. M. "Tony" Kramer - U.S. Corps of Engineers, Tulsa, OK
Larry Kruckenberg - N.D. Game & Fish Dept., Bismarck, ND
Roger Kupper - N.D. Game & Fish Dept., Ray, ND
John R. Langenbach - B.S.F.W., Chevy Chase, MD
Ken Loftus - Ont. Ministry of Nat. Resources, Toronto, Ont.
John Lohman - The Forum, Fargo, ND
Ronald Maier - N.D. Game & Fish Dept., Linton, ND
M. A. Marston - B.S.F.W., Arvada, CO
Dale N. Martin - B.S.F.W., Wayzata, MN
Wm. E. Martin - B.S.F.W., Lakeville, MN
Bill McDannold - N.D. Game & Fish Dept., Bismarck, ND
H. R. Morgan - N.D. Wildlife Federation, Bismarck, ND
R. L. Morgan - N.D. Game & Fish Dept., Bismarck, ND
Cliff Morrow - National Rifle Association, Washington, DC
Harvey K. Nelson - B.S.F.W., Jamestown, ND
James Nelson - B.S.F.W., Bismarck, ND
Russell Nylen - N.D. Game & Fish Dept., Bismarck, ND
Merrill L. Petoskey - Mich. Dept. of Nat. Res., Lansing, MI
Charles K. Phenicie - B.S.F.W., Kansas City, MO
William I. Phillips - Mo. Dept. of Conservation, Springfield MO
Wilmer Pich - N.D. Game & Fish Dept., Elgin, ND
John Popowski - S.D. Game, Fish & Parks Dept., Pierre, SD
Fred A. Priewert - Iowa Conservation Comm., Des Moines, IA
Charles Purkett - Mo. Dept. of Conservation, Jefferson City MO
Bob Rosette - Colorado Wildlife Division, Lamar, CO
Earl L. Sanderson - N.D. Game & Fish Dept., Devils Lake ND
Vic Schmidt - B.S.F.W., Chevy Chase, MD
Lyle J. Schoonover - B.S.F.W., Bismarck, ND
Charles Schroeder - N.D. Game & Fish Dept., Bismarck, ND
Fred N. Sears - Forestry, Fish & Game Comm., Colby, KS
H. H. Spitzer - N.D. Game & Fish Dept., Bismarck, ND
Jerry L. Stegman - B.S.F.W., Vienna, VA.
Howard Stout - N.D. Game & Fish Dept., Bismarck, ND
Russell W. Stuart - N.D. Game & Fish Dept., Bismarck, ND
C. W. Threinen - Wisc. Dept. of Nat. Resources, Madison WI
Lowell A. Tripp - N.D. Game & Fish Dept., Oakes ND
David B. Vesall - Minn. Dept. of Nat. Resources, St. Paul MN
Les Voigt - Wisc. Dept. of Nat. Resources, Madison, WI
Rolf Wallenstrom - B.S.F.W., Pierre, SD
Fred Warders - Forestry, Fish & Game Comm., Pratt KS
Richard D. Wettersten - Forestry, Fish & Game Comm., Pratt KS
W. M. White - B.S.F.W., Albuquerque, NM
Harvey Willoughby - B.S.F.W., Denver, CO
Jerry Wilson - B.S.F.W., Denver, CO
Harry R. Woodward - Ducks Unlimited, Denver, CO
Ralph Wright - N.D. Game & Fish Dept., Velva ND