23rd Annual Meeting

of

ASSOCIATION OF MIDWEST

FISH AND GAME COMMISSIONERS

1956

LIBRARY COPY
KANSAS FORESTRY, FISH
AND GAME COMMISSION
No.

P R O C E E D I N G S

OF

23rd Annual Meeting of

Association of Midwest Fish and
Game Commissioners

Held at Hotel St. Nicholas, Springfield, Illinois

July 9-11, 1956

First Session, A M., July 9

Meeting was called to order by Director Glen D. Palmer of the Illinois Department of Conservation, president of the Association, and made the following remarks:

Mr. Palmer:

Welcome to Illinois.

All of us are very proud and happy to have the leaders of the game and fish departments of the midwestern states and Canada as our guests in the greatest state in the nation.

That's tooting our own horn a bit loud, I'll admit, but we're mighty proud of Illinois and figure, as most of you probably do, that it doesn't hurt a bit to brag about your home state and its accomplishments.

I understand the first meeting of this organization was held in Iowa in 1934, and that conservation leaders of the midwest states have been getting together every year since that time. Perhaps some of you attended that first meeting, and I can imagine that you have witnessed countless changes in the intervening years.

If our association has followed the pattern of most groups of its type, it must have been founded by a handful of men of vision, who realized that by exchange of ideas and friendly cooperation the work of each state could be made more profitable and pleasant.

The organization certainly has had a big part to play in the tremendous developments which have been achieved in conservation in the last twenty years. I know that Illinois has profited and still is reaping benefits from its association with this group, and we are looking forward to many more years of sharing each other's successes.

Most of the Division Heads in our Department will be here at the confer-

ence at one time or another during the next two days, and I hope you will find opportunity to meet all of them and perhaps discuss any problems that our divisions may have in common with similar people in your own departments or commissions.

I am mighty proud of the men who head up our various sections and would like to introduce those who are here this morning. You'll get to meet the rest of them as the conference continues, but right now I want to introduce a man who really needs no introduction, because most of you know him. He is Lewis E. Martin, assistant director, who has been with the Department for more than 20 years. And, of course, I think all of you know Sam Parr. You'll be seeing a lot of him this conference. He's secretary-treasurer of the association, and, with the Department, is administrative assistant and superintendent of fisheries.

Just coming into the room is (E.E.) "Newt" Nuuttila, superintendent of forestry.

And, gentlemen, I want you to meet one of the grandest fellows we know, a member of our Conservation Advisory Board and head of one of the largest nurseries in the world, Mr. Arthur Hill of Hill Nurseries in Dundee, Ill. We invited all of our Advisory Board members to the conference, but this apparently was a busy week and they just couldn't make it. The Board has been performing a great service for conservation in Illinois and has just completed a brand new statement of policy which we believe will serve as a guide for the Department for many years.

(Mr. Palmer introduced a number of other Department employees who were present at the opening session, and then continued with his talk.)

I think you all received a copy of the program out at the registration desk. Your attention is called to entertainment for the ladies.

Mrs. Palmer is in charge of that part of the program, and will take them to New Salem State Park this morning for lunch and a tour of the Lincoln village

which has been recreated to memorialize the first six years Abe Lincoln spent in Illinois.

Tomorrow morning the ladies will visit the new State Office building of which we are so proud, the Capitol building, Lincoln's Tomb and Lincoln's Home. In the afternoon they will be guests of Governor and Mrs. Stratton at a tea in the Executive Mansion.

For the men, in addition to the formal program which will be held in this room both days, there is a smoker at 7 this evening. Last year in Milwaukee, Mr. Voigt was very kind to bring out some wonderful Wisconsin cheese and some of the liquids for which Milwaukee is famous. Well, I can tell you that Illinois has a few things just as good, and we also have cheese. You'll find out what I'm talking about this evening here on this floor.

Tuesday afternoon, there will be an inspection tour of our new conservation education area at the State Fairgrounds. A few of you have seen it already, but those who have not will have a real treat in store.

We designed and constructed the conservation area as a part of our education program, using about 40 acres off in one corner of the fairgrounds which once had been a game farm, but which in recent years has lain idle.

We have built three small lakes, developed three large game pastures, using erosion control practices, where we have large game animals such as deer, elk and buffalo, varieties which once roamed the prairies and forests of Illinois. We have every species of waterfowl common to the Mississippi flyway, and every game bird and animal, and predator bird and animal found in Illinois.

Our pens contain almost every variety of exotic birds and I'm sure you'll find one of the finest collections of pheasants anywhere in the United States.

We even have a miniature nursery designed after our regular state nurseries which produce 10 million seedling trees and shrubs for reforestation and game management every year.

The area is used in connection with our schools which are conducted each summer at the fairgrounds, and is open to the public throughout the year. School groups make good use of the exhibits and we have entertained visitors from nearly a dozen foreign countries.

Tuesday night will be the banquet, and Governor Stratton will be there to give you a talk. We are mighty fortunate in having a Governor with a real conservation background, and one who has backed us to the limit in an expanded program. I'm sure you will enjoy his talk tomorrow night and realize the tremendous importance of having a chief executive vitally interested in conservation work.

Wednesday will be open for field trips, and you have the whole state from which to choose. Our cars will be available to transport you to any section you desire to see, whether it be some of our 45 state parks and 29 memorials, or one of nearly a dozen lakes which have been constructed by the Department and are being maintained in state parks. We will have completed seven new lakes since 1953 by the end of this year, and have seven more in the engineering stage for the beginning of work next year. Plans for at least a dozen more have been discussed and they will become a reality as rapidly as we can obtain funds for their development. We recognize the water problem in Illinois and are trying to do something about it.

We have some mighty fine refuges and public hunting areas along the Illinois valley, on the Mississippi and down in the goose country of southern Illinois. You are welcome to see any of these, so just ask.

Before I conclude, I want to call your attention to the microphone in the center of the room. When speaking from the floor, please step up to the microphone and identify yourself. We are recording the proceedings and it will help if you mention your name and state.

Again, I say, it's grand to have you here and we want you to have a good

time. Make yourselves at home.

Now to get on with the formal part of the conference, here is our secretary-treasurer, Sam Parr, who will call the roll:

Director Palmer then turned the meeting over to Sam Parr, of the Illinois Department, secretary-treasurer of the Association, who called the roll.

Mr. H. R. Morgan, Commissioner of Game and Fish, State of North Dakota was then called upon to give the report of the Legislative Committee:

MR. H. R. MORGAN:

I learned through the grapevine, if you can call Tom Evans part of the vine, I had a letter from him sometime ago and he intimated that I would be making a report on legislation. I haven't as full a report as I would like to have for you this morning. I did take some of the more important bills that both the international, and this particular group have been interested in for a number of years. And I have prepared a very brief summary of the history of those bills in the Congress. The list includes HR 8954O, the water pollution bill, introduced by Congressman Blatkin of Minnesota; S2372, the McClellan bill, introduced by McClellan of Arkansas, which is proposed to strengthen the coordination act, two very badly needed amendments, HR1823, which earmarks ten percent of the revenue of the forest service for expenditure upon wildlife and recreation on forest preserves; HR10389, the Fernan-Day bill, which would require observance of state regulations for game on military reservations; S10875, previously HR12, the Soil Bank Act, which will be dealt with separately later on; and added to these, S3275, which, I think is adequately being taken care of in Congress right now through the amendments to the Bonner Bill; HR10371, the Engel Bill, to curb military land grabs. I shall try to be brief in the report and present the status of each of the above mentioned bills so far as I have been able to trace them up to now. Taking them in order mentioned, we have HR9540, Congressman Blatkin of Minnesota, the pollution bill. The bill was

reported favorably by the public works committee after having the approval of the River and Harbors Committee. A minority report signed by six members of the committee on public works would delete Section 6, which was the grants to municipalities for setting up water treatment plants in municipalities. On June 6 the House Rules Committee cleared the bill providing for amendments from the floor. On June the 13th, the House passed the bill. After the language in HR9540 was substituted for that of S890 previously passed by the Senate, a conference committee was requested. On June 25th, the conference committee cleared S890 in a satisfactory form with a slight cut in the amount of federal grants for helping to finance the cost of municipal sewage plants. The cut was from 33-1/3 percent to 30 per cent of the cost, so it wasn't too great a cut. An appropriation and final passage by both houses is considered likely on this bill.

S2370, known as the McClellan bill, is the bill which would strengthen the coordination act, Public Law 732. A resolution by this body was adopted at Estes Park last year to recommend certain changes. Hearing on this bill was postponed, because Interior and Budget had not reported. As of the 27th of June, I fine nothing to indicate that such a report has been made. I recommend that this group endeavor to force such a report while at this meeting.

HR1823, the Metcalf bill, would earmark 10% of the forest service revenue for expenditure for wildlife and recreation in National forests. Scheduled for hearing on June 26th, the 25th and 26th, in subcommittee of forestry for House agricultural committee; this bill had the opposition of the Bureau of the Budget, which opposes earmarking funds and also from Congressmen who believe that those using forests should pay their own way. I have nothing more recent than that date on the bill.

HR10389, the Fernan-Day bill, would require observance of state game laws on military reservations. The executive committee of the International request-

ed a re-draft of legislation proposed as of March 16, 1956. I have nothing further on that bill. HR10389 appears to be a satisfactory bill. It provides that game enforcement officers be permitted to enter and enforce game laws on federal areas after security clearance has been given. Hearings were scheduled before the House committee on merchant marine and fisheries for June 7th and I have heard nothing of it since.

S10875, formerly HR12, the Soil Bank bill, as I say, will be reported separately, and S3275, splitting the Fish and Wildlife Service, the one that has attracted a lot of interest very recently, I believe is coming out in an amended form of the Bonner bill, which seems to be satisfactory and have the support of all factions who are interested in the bill. This bill was passed by the Senate on the 24th of May and in its original form would have made sports fishing the stepchild of commercial fishing interests, as I understand it. On the 27th of June, when I drew this up, there had been no further action taken on the bill. President Eisenhower was at that time threatening to set up a Bureau of Fisheries by executive order on July 1. On or about June 22nd, Guthermuth, Callison, Stroud, Stiles and Biggs, met with Secretary Seaton. The result, a modified version of HR 11570, the Bonner bill, which will keep the Fish and Wildlife Service together while providing relief for commercial fisheries. It is believed that this bill will carry without much opposition. The committee on merchant marine and fisheries of the House reported for passage of the Bonner bill on June 21.

HR10371, the Engel bill, would curb withdrawals from public domain land for military purposes. Scheduled for hearing before the House committee on interior and insular affairs on June 11th and 12th. This hearing was interrupted. Nothing more has been reported as of the 27th of June. Since that time, however, hearings were again scheduled for July 2nd and 3rd. The military, of course, objects to two sections of the bill, the one pertaining to

water rights established under state law and the one requiring observance of state conservation laws. I have nothing more recent on that bill.

HR8750, the bill to amend Public Law 566, the watershed protection and flood prevention act, is the one that you will hear from as soon as the committees' report is typed up.

This, Mr. Chairman, completes the very brief and sketchy report that I have prepared for this meeting.

Mr. Palmer then asked for a report from the Crossley S-D Surveys Progress Report Committee and Mr. L. P. Voigt, of the Wisconsin Department, asked that William White, of the Fish and Wildlife Service, be allowed to report on the national level and that he would report later on the state level.

Mr. White's remarks follow:

As you gentlemen will recall, the Service let a contract on June 1st, 1955 with the National Survey Organization of Crossley S-D Surveys, Incorporated. This was done after we solicited bids from about 20 survey organizations. This was considered to be one of the top survey organizations of this type in the country. Shortly after the contract was let, a questionnaire was developed which I am sure all of you have seen by this time, and it was pre-tested last summer. Over 700 households were visited throughout the United States in the pre-test that covered about six cities and 300 interviews were held with hunters and fishermen. On the basis of that the questionnaire was modified slightly and considered a success. During the fall and winter, training sessions were held in New York City with the field supervisors of the Crossley firm, and then these supervisors held training sessions with interviewers out in the field. Each interviewer was required to pass written examinations on the survey, and also conduct practice interviews. The sampling procedure that was used in this survey was what is known as an area probability. This type of a sample theoretically each household in the United States has some chance of

being included. Also, households in each of the 48 states were included. The sample was actually selected both on the basis of population density, and on the basis of state hunting and fishing license sales--the incidence of sales in proportion to the population. Interviewing began last January. This was done after quite a bit of publicity in state publications, national conservation bulletins, newspapers, magazines, radio stations, and television stations. There was a tremendous amount of publicity in connection with this survey, and this resulted in a very low refusal rate. It's unusually low for a survey of this type. Practically everyone knew something about it. During the survey, about 20,000 households throughout the United States were contacted, some up to four times, and altogether there were over 9,000 interviews with hunters and fishermen. Over 9,000 questionnaires were filled out. The results are still being tabulated. They are not quite completed. We were supposed to have received our report on June 15, but machine tabulation was a little more complicated than anyone anticipated. There are, altogether, about 100,000 punch cards being sorted between one machine and another, back and forth. Figures are starting to come through now; we expect to have all of them this week. It looks pretty good. Expenditures are going to be somewhere in the billions; we're not sure just exactly how many, right now. We're planning to release the official service report on the survey on September 14th at the International meeting in Toronto, but in advance of the meeting--sometime shortly after August 1st--we plan to get out the findings to the states so that they will have this information. Our report will contain a brief introduction material describing the purpose of the survey and how it was conducted, then it will contain the findings and a brief discussion of the methodology. We figure on a report of about 60 pages; it won't be too long. We'll follow that up, then, with a technical supplement which will contain all the detailed methodology, the description of the questionnaire, and how it was used, and that sort of

thing. We don't expect to have it ready by the September 14 meeting. I might mention that there are a number of limitations which we imposed on the survey. We wanted it to be conservative but the various things that will tend to make the figures somewhat smaller than it might be; the figure on expenditures for one thing we only counted expenditures on trips that were primarily for hunting and fishing. On food expenditures, we discounted those by expenditures which would have been made at home if the trip hadn't occurred. On mileage, we figured only actual operating costs. What the survey is showing is cash outlays during 1955, so we're using the figure of 3-1/2 cents a mile. There's nothing for depreciation in there, just actual expenditures during the year. Only people who actually hunted or fished during 1955 were interviewed. If they'd hunted the year before or planned to hunt the year after and had purchased equipment, they still wouldn't be interviewed in this survey. But even so, we're going to come up with a surprisingly high figure. Another thing of interest, the United Nations gets out a periodic report in which they describe surveys of current interest being conducted by the various countries. They've selected this survey of ours by the Crossley people to appear in the next report. It will have a brief description of the survey together with those of a number of other countries. I have something here that -- a little human interest. Some of the Crossley interviewers had some rather startling experiences in California but due to their length will be omitted. You will get a report, probably, after August 1st. Thank you.

Mr. Voigt then gave the following report on the state level:

Thank you, Bill. I want to thank you for this fine report. As I have indicated previously, I'm going to talk about the state level and what we attempted to do on a regional level. Some of you may recall that shortly after the national investigation was reported that we attempted, in a meeting in Milwaukee, to organize some regional questions which we felt might have some merit for the

states that were going to participate, in addition to the federal survey. This attempt for regional questions failed and three of the states that were at our meeting in Milwaukee--Iowa, Tennessee and Wisconsin--did contract for separate state surveys. I understand, throughout the country, five other states, including New York and Texas, made contracts also. By having our state information, it'll produce the first opportunity for comparison between these eight states in regard to total sport hunting and fishing expenditures, and also their average per capita or per acre relationship. Even though all of the states were warned by Mr. Crossley that the national survey facts can't be considered valid if divided on the basis of population or acreage in a single state, I still think most all states will be able to draw some comparisons with the adjacent states who have a valid survey through the individual contract. In this way for example, Michigan and Missouri might interpret values for their states in comparison with valid data for Wisconsin and Iowa. Although this practice statistically could be subject to criticism, it would be much more acceptable than the practice of taking percentage of the national totals. However, the states which did participate, no doubt, will secure the greatest benefit. This, as Mr. White pointed out, is probably hopeful prophecy, because we haven't seen the data yet and it hasn't been analyzed. Properly interpreted, I feel it can prove of considerable benefit and prove the importance of fishing and hunting to the outdoor recreational industry to our state and national economy. These findings may help us in appraising losses and gains resulting from changes in land and water use for comparative value in multiple use projects. In any such appraisals or comparisons it will be important that the data resulting from the survey isn't misrepresented. There may be some temptation to state that these expenditures by hunters and fishermen are the value of the wildlife resources. This would be a very loose interpretation and quite incorrect. The survey doesn't propose to estimate any wildlife values as those from trapping, for food, for fibre, from

commercial preserves, farms, ponds, and for the ecological or aesthetic benefits received from wildlife. Great care must be used in comparing the expenditures of hunters and fishermen in pursuit of their sport with such entirely different things as the state's corn crop, total output of crude forest products, or such things as annual retail trade. This would be a comparison of dissimilar data which could bring discredit on the value of the survey. If such unrelated figures are used to show the magnitude of expenditures by hunters and fishermen in pursuit of their sport, it should be clearly shown by those doing the interpreting that the totals are not comparable. Although it may seem from these dangers of interpretation that we might be questioning the value of the survey, such is not the case. Besides the economic aspects, each state could benefit from new knowledges gained as to the hunting and fishing interests of their citizens in rural communities, small villages, and large urban centers. There will also be valuable data in regard to sex and age of participants in these outdoor sports, and new facts which aren't required now for hunting license data or fishing license data. In many respects, this is a census of hunters and fishermen which will have its greatest value in comparison in another survey say at ten year intervals such as the U.S. census data is being carried out. In this way it would be helpful in planning future progress as related to expected needs. For those states like our own Wisconsin which is securing surveys, a comparison on many aspects of sport fishing and hunting expenditures as related to age, sex and other population factors will now be possible. A comparison with national averages will also be possible and this might be of special interest. These comparisons, by way of caution, must be considered carefully. For instance, although Wisconsin may sell the most non-resident fishing licenses in the country, this expenditure by the fishermen attracted by our Wisconsin resource wouldn't show up in our Wisconsin figures on expenditure. They would show up in other states. As this national survey procedure is improved in future years

the proper proration and adjustment of such factors would make it more valuable to all of the states. While the national survey questions were largely aimed at securing factual answers, many of our questions which we put up in addition to the national questions were public opinion questions. Possibly some of the other seven states who contracted for a survey did the same thing, but we found that these additional questions didn't cost us much more than validating the national questions so that we wanted the public opinion questions. We felt that as far as Wisconsin is concerned, the answer to these opinion questions would probably be of the greatest value from the standpoint of our future program which we were setting up and possible legislative proposals which we wanted to make to our legislature. At the time that the interviewing job was being set up we were asked by Crossley not to release the questions, because they felt that it might have a bearing on the answers that were given. However, now, all of the questions have been asked and filed so that we have available copies here of the particular questions which we in Wisconsin asked. The first two questions which we asked of all families contacted was to determine their attitude on state park financing which Ernie and a good many of you knew has been a troublesome problem in Wisconsin for some time. We wanted to find out how familiar they were with our program. The separate groups of questions asked these people who were hunter and fishermen of their willingness to pay increased license fees for additional program. The answers to these questions will be most timely and interesting to us. If this answer is favorable for increased fees, we could use this report as evidence to support a request for such larger fees. If the answer is negative, I suppose we'll find out that we need a little more educational work. As far as the fishermen are concerned, we felt that we'd like to know the types of fishing and the types of fish they would prefer, if they knew exactly what they wanted. Their attitudes, the fishermen's, that is, on such matters as liberalized size and bag limits and the need for public fishing areas access to

them will be of great value to us. In the questions to the hunters, their attitudes as to expanded public hunting grounds, managed hunting areas, and pheasant stocking programs were secured. It's possible that the lack of public understanding on the details of such a complex subject as managed hunting may result in negative answers. Although this result may be undesirable, it will tell us where and how much information will have to be distributed in the future to explain the program. It is our belief that the results of these questionnaire surveys are public information, even though the questions frequently were asked mainly to help us appraise our own program. Several questions were asked of both fishermen and hunters as to their opinion on our publicity media, research and management projects, and reaction received from the contact of the public with our employees in the field. We hope that the majority of these public opinion answers will be favorable, if they aren't we're going to roll up our sleeves and go to work on them. These national and state surveys will help to publicize the importance of hunting and fishing to the economy of the states, and to the nation as the incentive responsible for a chain reaction, which multiplies its effect on many related occupations from bait dealers to the resort industry. The shift of money, seasonally, into these remote areas of the state or the nation is important to entire segments of the people dependent on businesses related to outdoor recreation. This economic aspect of hunting and fishing may be important to the economy, therefore vital to the future of fish and other wildlife. At least, it is one good reason why both of these industries which are benefitted, and legislative bodies should support sound conservation management and restoration programs. But we must not forget that outdoor recreation has even greater values which help maintain the American way of life and improve the national welfare to more healthful living habits. The economic value of this factor as well as many other intangible wildlife values certainly are not being measured by this survey. Later this year, when the large figures of 1955 expenditures

by hunters and fishermen are publicized, they should be used wherever possible in planning programs to meet future demands on both the resources and administrative agencies. No doubt this demand will have to be met to a larger extent by improving the quality of these recreational opportunities as well as the quantity. This can't be done unless we are willing to meet some of our shortcomings and search for ways to improve our service to the public. In this same spirit, any limitation of these surveys, the economic aspects of hunting and fishing should be readily admitted. We feel the results will be a milestone of progress in the field of wildlife management, and in the public awareness of the importance of wildlife to the local community, to the state and the nation.

A report was then called for from the Small Watershed Committee and appears below:

In April 1956, a meeting was held in St. Paul, Minnesota, to discuss the Soil Bank legislation which was pending at that time. Since there was also pending a number of bills which would amend Public Law # 566, it was decided to discuss that matter also. However, due to lack of any clear-cut information as to effects of the proposed amendments, a Committee was appointed to investigate the subject further and to report at this meeting. That is the background for this report. The Committee, however, has gone further than merely considering amendments. It has analyzed the Small Watershed Program and in this report points out some shortcomings and some desirable changes.

Initial information indicate that amendments to the Small Watershed Act would greatly accelerate farm drainage. As you all know, farm drainage is not in need of any accelerating legislation. Inquiry by the Committee revealed that the bill receiving most attention is H.R. 8750. This bill does not stimulate drainage directly, but it does have undesirable features. This will be covered later.

It is unnecessary to say that virtually all conservationists and conservation agencies and organizations supported the small watershed approach to flood control, water run-off retardation, and soil conservation. Headwaters control has always seemed to be the soundest approach to holding water where it falls. Placing the responsibility for soil and water management in the hands of local groups and landowners, to be assisted by governmental agencies, also has had the support of conservationists.

An analysis of proposed small watershed projects and of the work to be done under such projects leads this Committee to the conclusion that the program in some midwestern states is not operating as it was visualized. Specifically, drainage has already become a very important part of small watershed projects, especially in North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota. In these states a high percentage of the projects includes the drainage of thousands of acres of prime waterfowl breeding habitat. In Minnesota for example, out of 13 proposed projects, nine contain some wetlands acreages. These acreages vary from 175 to 18,777. Total acreage of the 13 watersheds is 836,724 of which 46,462 acres are marshes or lakes. In five of the watersheds wetlands comprise from 10 - 20% of the total area. No definite figures are available as to how much of these wetlands will be drained. However, the history of landuse planning in some of the watersheds, prior to initiation of the small watershed program, is sufficient indication that drainage is an important motivating force for the projects. In North Dakota stream channel straightening and removal of debris in channels have become important functions of small watershed projects. Biologists from the state conservation departments and Fish and Wildlife Service are working constantly with the watershed planning teams in an effort to save at least a portion of the wetlands. It cannot be denied that wetland drainage will be extensive under some Public Law #566 projects.

The Small Watershed Act includes the following language, "It is the sense

of Congress that the Federal Government should co-operate with States and their political subdivisions - - - for the purpose of preventing such (flood) damage and of furthering the conservation, development, utilization and disposal of water and thereby of preserving and protecting the Nation's land and water resources." In view of such a statement it would seem the conservation, development and utilization should receive at least equal emphasis with disposal. Disposal has come to be the primary concern in many projects. It is the feeling, though unsubstantiated, that "disposal" was intended to mean the orderly running-off of surplus or flood waters. Present philosophy seems to be that "disposal" means getting rid, as quickly as possible, of all surface water in a watershed, even though such water has accumulated in natural reservoirs and regardless of its values in its natural location.

Upstream watershed control is visualized as holding water in the soil or in permanent or temporary reservoirs. Present projects in some areas propose to eliminate nature's existing reservoirs and run the water off as rapidly as possible - this in the name of water run-off retardation.

In North Dakota a small watershed project philosophy is expressed in one work plan as follows, "Some unidentifiable benefits will accrue from drainage. It has been noted from past experience in the Lake Plain areas that land drainage is a good flood prevention measure. It provides for more storage of excess water in the soil, thereby reducing run-off." The Committee points out that this might be true under certain conditions of soil type, slope, vegetative cover and rainfall intensity. However, it has been noted in many areas that drainage in headwaters areas has resulted in increased rather than decreased flooding of lands below the drained areas. Another quote from the same work plan goes as follows, "The sponsors also feel that more of the drainage benefits should be considered as flood prevention benefits and should not be charged to the local landowners. Therefore, the Federal Government should assume a

larger share of the cost." This "hand-out" philosophy of draining the life blood from the soil at public expense is common throughout the marsh and pot-hole country of the Dakotas and Minnesota, and possibly elsewhere.

A second feature of some watershed planning which can be found in all states is that of upland land conversions which result in destruction of wild-life habitat. Woodlands, thickets, and grasslands may be converted to pasture or cropland. Virtually all existing vegetation in a watershed has some erosion and flood control value. In some cases, certainly, better control may be achieved by conversions. However, if conservation, development and utilization of the water resource is of primary concern in a project, then the destruction of existing cover through land conversion should be held to a minimum. Extensive changes to more intensive land use, through either drainage or land clearing could only be construed to be in the interest of creating more agricultural land and in making each individual farm enterprise more efficient at public expense.

So much for a general appraisal of some undesirable features of the program. There will, of course, be benefits as well. The extent of these benefits will depend on the kind of co-operation that exists between the small watershed groups and the fish and wildlife agencies, State or Federal. In some states there appears to be excellent co-operation and little conflict of interest. This is true in Wisconsin.

Careful and co-operative planning will result in the replacement of much of the wildlife habitat which is destroyed. It can result in some watersheds in the creation of more good habitat than existed previously. Developments around detention reservoirs can be extremely beneficial as can the maintenance of minimum pools in reservoirs of sufficient size. Reduction of flooding in the bottomlands can be beneficial to wildlife.

It has come to the attention of this Committee that discontinuance of the preliminary field examinations is being considered. We feel these early

examinations are valuable to all the co-operating agencies and can be helpful to the approving bodies. Many desirable and undesirable features of individual projects can be pointed out as a result of these preliminary examinations.

On the basis of the Committee's analysis we make the following recommendations:-

1. Drainage or clearing which is done primarily to bring new land into production of farm crops should not be a Federal cost sharing item in Small Watershed Projects.
2. Projects which are primarily drainage, even though they have some flood control and water conservation features, should not be included in the Small Watershed Program.
3. Water is important to all the people, and development of this resource should consider all interests and uses. Multiple use, including recreation, should be thoroughly investigated, and where such possibilities exist and are feasible, the primary sponsors should make every effort to secure additional sponsorship for these added values.
4. Field examinations, prior to approval by the designated state body or by the SCS Administrator, should be continued. Ample time should be provided for all interested agencies to make adequate examinations prior to approval by the state approving body.
5. Amending legislation should be sought which would more clearly spell out what the Federal expenditures and authorizations should be under this Act. It should provide a clear cut statement to the effect that the Soil Conservation Service participation under the act shall consist of, (1) land treatment for the purpose of holding water on the uplands, (2) detention

reservoirs, involving Federal expenditures, only when needed to control excess run off which can not be controlled with the upland use practices and then when such detention reservoirs are needed, that they be installed and managed giving full consideration to all interests including wildlife and recreation and (3) that justifiable projects shall be financed by the beneficiaries.

To get down to the primary reason for appointment of this Committee, it is a study of proposed amendments to Public Law #566. As stated previously, H.R. 8750, Poage (Texas), has received the most attention. This bill has the support of most conservation organizations primarily because it would speed up the small watershed program. In view of some of the points made earlier, it is doubtful that it should be speeded up in some areas.

The first amending provision may be considered beneficial. It provides, in Section 2(2), for "works of improvement for conservation, development, utilization and disposal of water" for purposes other than agricultural. It also provides that single structures with more than 5,000 acre feet may be installed, if the capacity in excess of 5,000 acre feet is for purposes other than flood prevention, and the total cost of the excess capacity is borne by the local organization.

Another amending provision, Section 4, Paragraph 2, while not involving wildlife, does seem questionable. It states, "That the Secretary shall not require local organizations to assume any part of the construction cost of structural measures applicable to flood prevention. In some projects flood control benefits will accrue only to the people in the watershed. In at least one field examination report on an Illinois project the statement is made that no measurable benefits outside the watershed are indicated. It would seem that the local sponsors should then pay or at least share the costs. One dangerous aspect of this provision is the possible interpretation of the term "structural

measures." Drainage ditches might be termed "structural measures applicable to flood prevention" and local sponsors would not have to bear any of the cost.

The major amendment which might speed up the program is one which would make it unnecessary for the Department of Interior to review plans for these projects where the Federal contribution to construction costs is less than $250,000. This means that the Fish and Wildlife Service would not be required to review plans for the majority of small watershed projects since on most projects the Federal share of construction cost would not exceed $250,000. This is especially true of the drainage type of project.

In the same section Congress and the President are eliminated from considering any project where the Federal share does not exceed $250,000. The word "Wildlife" is added in this section. As amended the affected section would read, "Provided further that whenever the Federal contribution to the construction cost of works of improvements in any watershed or subwatershed area shall exceed $250,000, at least 45 days (counting only days occuring during any regular or special sessions of Congress) before such installation involving Federal assistance is commenced, the Secretary shall transmit a copy of the plan and the justification therefor to the Congress through the President: Provided further, that any such plan (a) involving an estimated Federal contribution to construction costs in excess of $250,000 which includes reclamation or irrigation works or which affects public or other lands or wildlife under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Interior -- shall be submitted to the Secretary of Interior, --- 60 days prior to transmission of the plan to Congress through the President."

It is the feeling of this Committee that the Secretary of the Interior should review all plans where wildlife or lands under his jurisdiction is involved. Ten projects involving Federal cost of $25,000 each can be just as damaging to wildlife as one project involving $250,000 in Federal costs.

The final provision, adding Section 8, authorizes the Secretary to make loans to local organizations to finance the local share of costs of carrying out works of improvement. Such loans would be repaid in not more than 50 years. Under this provision the Federal Government would pay all costs of drainage initially, with the landowner having 50 years in which to pay his share.

The Committee feels that H.R. 8750 is not a good bill and that it should not have the support of conservation organizations.

Committee Members:

M. O. Steen
J. W. Kimball
L. P. Voigt
H. R. Morgan
T. R. Evans, Chairman

July 9, 1956

Upon motion duly made and unanimously passed, the Association of Midwest Game and Fish Commissioners in convention assembled at Springfield, Illinois, on July 10, 1956, accepted the foregoing report and approved its distribution to appropriate conservation agencies and organizations and to appropriate members of Congress.

Sam A. Parr, Secretary
Association of Midwest Game
and Fish Commissioners

MR. PALMER:

Gentlemen, I believe we have just heard a very complete report of Mr. White, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Mr. Voigt of Wisconsin on the Crossley surveys, Mr. Morgan of Dakota on the Legislative Committee, and Tom Evans' report on Small Watershed Committee. They have certainly spent a lot of time and effort on these reports and I really believe they are to be commended.

MR. STEEN (Nebraska):

If there are no objections, and I think it's appropriate at this time, I'd like to move that this association do adopt the report on small watersheds and do instruct the secretary to forward copies to appropriate agencies and individuals. I so move, sir.

MR. SPRECKER (Wisconsin):

Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering if there will be any discussion on these reports. I know we have a couple of gentlemen here in the crowd that have spent many years on this watershed management problem and I am sure they might have some comments to make. I believe that Mr. Evans has pointed out some of the very objectional features of Public Law 566, or the proposed change in the Law. I think he's pointed out the apparent futility of trying to do anything in Washington to correct the situation. I'm wondering if we don't have to go back on the home front and fight this thing out in our own states. That's what we've been doing in Wisconsin. We've tackled every legislative proposal that smells of drainage. I'm wondering what the other states are doing along those lines.

MR. PALMER:

Mr. Sprecker, I believe we had a motion before this meeting.

MR. STEEN:

I made the motion on the assumption that there would be no objection. Certainly if the association desires to discuss this report, we should do so. And I believe we have plenty of time for it.

MR. PALMER:

All right. The chair is open for any discussion. Who would like to comment?

JIM KIMBALL (Minnesota):

I'm on the committee and wish that I'd had a lot more to do with that report because I think it is very fine. I'm sure it has been well worth while, because Tom Evans has done a very fine job. I just want to go on record as being in favor of it. I don't think I have any other comments on that, George. Maybe some of the men from your state do.

MR. SCHRADER (Fish and Wildlife Service):

I have nothing but the highest praise for the report. I would like to bring out or emphasize one point, perhaps what Mr. Sprecker was bringing out. Fortunately, or unfortunately, I think most of you know that I spent the last five months in Washington and four weeks of that period I was in the technical review staff of the Department of Interior making this review that the Department of Interior makes of these small watershed reports before they are sent to the Congress. During that time I had the opportunity to review most of the 25 projects that are up to the Congress for action or inaction as the case may be. None of these were of the type which are the principle bad type of project that Tom has called attention to, that is, projects which involved a lot of drainage. If there was one thing that appalled me about these 25 some reports it was the apparent failure to give any consideration to fish and wildlife management in the proposed work plan. Now, the Department of Agriculture has ruled that they don't have to consult with the Fish and Wildlife Service under the provisions of Public Law 566. However, they have appeared to be willing to go along with the review and the state game and fish department in the Fish and Wildlife Service under this memorandum of understanding have had an opportunity to review the plans and make recommendations for fish and wildlife management. There has been an almost complete failure to incorporate in the work plan any of the recommendations made by the Fish and Wildlife Service. It appears to me that unless the states will get out themselves and actively promote fish and wildlife development in the work plans, there isn't going to be much, because there's no obligation on the part of the Department of Agriculture or the local sponsors to incorporate any fish and wildlife management in these plans. We are powerless to do anything about it. If they ignore our recommendations, that's their privilege. Unless the states get out and promote this thing themselves, I think you folks have some power to veto or insist that the management

of fish and wildlife be incorporated in these plans. It's going to be up to you to take the necessary action to get that incorporated, otherwise it isn't going to be there. Those 25 plans that I reviewed have gone to Congress. None of them have any specific wildlife management measures incorporated in the work plans.

MR. BODE (Missouri):

We happen to have a man here from our staff who has been doing a tremendous amount of work on these flood control projects and with the Army engineers. He raises a question to which I think we should give very close consideration with regard to this report, and with your permission I'd like to have Mr. Carl Norin make the remarks he just made to me.

MR. NORIN (Missouri):

If I understood correctly, one of the recommendations of the committee report was to this effect: that those measures of flood control which were not accomplished by land treatment measures should be carried out by the Corps of Engineers and not by the Soil Conservation Service. That was my understanding of the recommendation. If that is the correct interpretation of the recommendation, I would like to point out that we're stepping into a field that's fraught with all sorts of conflict; that there are areas in which the S.C.S. works effectively for flood control without particular harm to wildlife and there are areas in which pure land treatment measures apparently cannot accomplish flood control according to hydrologists, and some type of structural control is going to be necessary. Now, it strikes me that if this group were to take the stand that the people of the United States should not be permitted to try to achieve for themselves flood control by structural measures on the smaller watersheds when in fact there are instances when the only method by which it can be achieved is by structural measures, and the agency set-up is such that it would

normally fall to the Department of Agriculture, then we would be in essence, I think, ruling out this approach of flood control for agricultural interests. Now I think, certainly, there are cases in the drainage field and so on where 566 has serious detrimental implications. There are other instances where if you make a blanket ruling like this, I think you would be treading on toes to no avail, where it would do no benefit to wildlife. I think it would work adversely to the wildlife interests in creating a lot of antagonism from the agricultural interests where they were not adversely affecting us. That's the point I wanted to make.

MR. EVANS:

I think there's a little misunderstanding in what was meant by that statement, Carl. It was not intended to imply that land treatment measures would not include detention reservoirs. I believe the statement is made that the Soil Conservation Service activity would be restricted to land treatment measures which would hold water in the uplands which was construed to mean holding it in the soil and on top of the ground with their headwaters reservoirs. It merely split it between headwaters control and, I would say, the main stem controlled by the Corps. It was not intended to rule out the thing that you're getting at. Now if it does that, perhaps the language should be changed.

MR. JANZEN (Fish and Wildlife Service):

I don't want to add fuel to this fire, but I know very well the sort of thing that Tom is talking about. I happen to know of one particular project involving a main feature of a small watershed was the construction of a ditch. The Corps of Engineers had a project on this and we tried to compromise and say if the objective was to eliminate water we would go for a wider ditch that would take the water out of the watershed, but we didn't want the deeper ditch which would make it possible to drain some valuable marshlands adjoining it. The

Corps finally decided to give up on the project, because of the opposition from both the Service and the state, but they informally informed me that, if they moved out they were almost certain that the S.C.S. would move in with a small watershed project and do the same thing. I can see where that sort of thing is what complicates the picture, and we don't know where that particular project stands. I wanted to comment on one part of your report, Tom. You indicated the total acreages of marsh and water, but said you did not know what percent might be drained. The bad feature of some of these small watershed projects that we've been looking at up in that glaciated pothole country is that the primary feature is a big ditch out of the watershed to get the water out in a bigger hurry. They said our objective is not to drain the small marsh areas and we aren't going to help that. But that's just about like saying we're going to build a big highway into an untapped wilderness, but we don't intend to develop the area, because we know when that ditch is built every farmer has the opportunity of draining into it. We try to compromise by saying "How about building a wider ditch to get off the surplus water?" And then, of course, the truth comes out. That is not satisfactory. They want a deeper ditch in order that we can put more land under cultivation. I thought I'd bring out this little fact of life, because it is all-important in this picture.

MR. STEEN:

To clarify this thing, I'd like to modify or amend my motion to provide that we do approve this report with the understanding that the chairman of the committee amplify and modify the language in such a manner as to meet the suggestions of the gentleman from Missouri.

MR. EVANS:

I would just like to re-emphasize the one statement that I made in starting, that we realize the things which are included in the report do not apply to all

states, but that they do very definitely apply to this specific area, and they apply to the preservation of a resource which is important to every state in this midwest association. For that reason I feel that we should look at it from that standpoint. I want to emphasize again that the committee is not unaware of the benefits of the small watersheds program. We also are aware of the detrimental and damaging features of it. There's no question in my mind but what some of the proposed amendments will just open the door all the wider for drainage to be carried on in the name of small watershed programs and the name of water run-off retardation. I agree wholeheartedly with Tom Schrader's comments that it is up to the states to work with the sponsoring agency in this program. But some of these things where you just can't get anywhere with the local sponsors as long as they persist in trying to interpret the language of the Act and to twist some of the language around to continue to serve the purpose of drainage, then there's only one thing to do and that is to try and write the law in such a way that it can't be so twisted. You don't get anywhere with education soon enough to preserve the resource. And that, I think, is the thing we've got to look at.

MR. PALMER:

Anyone else have any comment?

MR. BODE:

I would be willing to second the modified motion as Mr. Steen presented it.

MR. PALMER:

Is there any other discussion, gentlemen?

If not, you have heard the motion by Mr. Steen, seconded by Mr. Bode. If there are no further comments, all those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Contrary?

The motion carried.

At this time I wish to introduce Mr. James Kimball, Vice President of this organization and chairman of the resolutions committee, who, I believe, has some announcements to make. Mr. Kimball.

MR. KIMBALL (Minnesota):

I'd just like to read off, first of all, the names of the members of the resolutions committee. I. T. Bode, Mel Steen, J. W. Malaher, Elmer Peterson, Harley Hook, Harry Rule. Will all of you who have resolutions turn them in either to me or to one of the members of this committee. And I'd like to announce to the committee that we'll have a meeting immediately after this program this afternoon, that is, after the 4 o'clock item on the program.

MR. PALMER:

Nominating committee. Perhaps some of you know, due to illness, Mr. Bruce Stiles who was chairman of that committee is unable to attend, and I have appointed Ray Beckman of Iowa as chairman; Mr. Rule of Michigan, and myself. The auditing committee. Mr. Lehee I don't believe is here. So, I'll appoint Mr. George Sprecker of Wisconsin, and Mr. Lester Faber of Iowa on that committee; Mr. Sprecker is chairman.

Gentlemen, no meeting of this character can really be a success without a real good program. That program must be interesting, informative and educational. If you can combine all three of those things into a program, then you do have a good program and you do have a successful convention. I personally know it takes a great deal of work, and a lot of thought to come through with a program such as we have. I believe we owe a vote of thanks to the chairman, Mr. Hayden Olds of Ohio, for the wonderful program he came through with, and for the many hours he spent in making it possible. Other members of the committee were Tom Kimball of Colorado, Les Voigt of Wisconsin, Mr. Harkness of Ontario, Canada, Mr. Clark, also of Ontario, Bruce Stiles of Iowa, and Mr. Morgan of North

Dakota. Do you have any comments, Mr. Olds, that you'd like to give at this time?

MR. OLDS (Ohio):

Mr. Chairman, only to thank the members of the committee. I would like to say this: that in asking for the assistance of the committee members it was forthcoming freely with a lot of suggestions. One individual said it wasn't worthwhile coming to the meeting if we didn't have longer programs than we had last year or the other years. Others felt that we should put more time on fewer subjects, but trying to put it all together we did come up with the program you have, and we hope that it will be both profitable and interesting.

MR. PALMER:

Thank you, Mr. Olds, and I'm sure it will be.

Is there anything further at this time? If not, gentlemen, we'll stand adjourned until this afternoon at 1:30.

SECOND SESSION, P.M., JULY 9

MR. PALMER:

...Mr. Tom Kimball, Director of Conservation of Colorado.

MR. KIMBALL (Colorado):

Mr. President, I wonder if I could ask the persons who will present papers if they'd come up, please, and take their places here at the stands.

As you can see from the list of topics to be discussed this afternoon, we have a considerable number and I think that we'll handle the program by calling for a discussion after each topic. So as soon as the papers on state water rights law are presented we will call for a discussion on that particular phase of the program, and then on each succeeding phase as we go along.

MR. SWIFT (Washington, D.C.):

Members of the Midwest, I'm really glad to be here. I have attended more of these meetings than I've ever missed, in a different capacity. I was glad to point out that we had one member that was a charter member this morning. I. T. Bode, and up to 1954, from the second meeting on, I think I've attended all of the Midwest meetings. They used to have some rugged arguments 20 years ago, too, and when you mention old Order G28, that rather dates a fellow as to how long he's been in this business. I'm also very sorry that Roy Tulane isn't here, because he would give you some legalistic backgrounds that I certainly couldn't and I hadn't planned on giving. I don't know what his paper was, but I do think that he would have given a great deal of the legal history. Incidentally, he was the man who fought this now rather famous Namacogan case through the Supreme Court for the state of Wisconsin. And he has a very good background on this matter of water not only in that state, but in others. So I hadn't planned on talking too much or giving too much history regarding cases. I did want to say to you gentlemen that you'd better be prepared to gird your loins to the biggest and toughest fight that you've ever been in. In my opinion, your rights to the use of water will dwarf any other fight that you will have in the years to come. As I previously said, I'm not going to attempt to review the maze of legal history or all of the conflicting briefs on jurisprudence. The philosophy of water uses differs in each of the 48 states and what's considered navigable in one state isn't applicable in another due to its laws, tradition, and so forth. And protecting these water rights is going to revolve, in a great measure, in the state itself. The more humid areas have developed traditions that differ from that of the arid. I have not had the time, nor am I qualified, to interpret all these confusions of laws, traditions and philosophies. However, gentlemen, this does not diminish my awareness through years of active contact with this subject, as

to what lies ahead and the need for a lot of dynamic leadership and firm convictions are going to be necessary by you people. State by state leadership must fall on each of you conservation directors on this particular subject. As each of you have accepted the job of being a director with all its honor, so you've got to accept the responsibility, regardless of what may happen to you as an individual. The people of your states are going to look to you for guidance and advice. This is one subject, in my opinion, that's most confusing in the minds of many of the laymen. They know least accurately about their rights and limitations than they do of my other subject. These same people are assuming that you'll keep them appraised of events and what's good and reasonable in proposed legislation and what's going to be damaging. The public little realizes that many of its public rights have already been stolen from them or destroyed by the erosion of public indifference. Very few public rights have the same connotation that they did some years ago. The public is beginning to lose its rights in its last resource--water. Public rights in water in many states from the Mississippi east is all that the people have got left and in some of the western states where there are large chunks of public domain, people have the idea that they can roam at will. Those states have already lost their equity in water so far as a public resource. Tom Evans was talking about the little watershed program this morning. It started out with an idea basically by many of the conservationists to do something on the tributaries and the small watershed areas with a philosophy for wildlife, and it's being diverted into other purposes. I certainly agree with Tom that with these present amendments, it is dangerous and damaging. Some time ago in the Conservation News I made a statement on this matter of water and the revision of laws and its dangers to wildlife, and in essence I believe that this statement is as true today as it was then, and I'm going to review a little of it.

Wildlife agencies and sportsmen in the midwest and the east who have grown

accustomed to taking fish and game waters for granted are likely to find themselves holding an empty bucket under a dry spigot, if the present movement to revise state water laws is allowed to proceed without thorough study and alert participation. At least 14 states which have followed the doctrine of riparion rights, or whose water laws are based on the historic Northwest Territory Ordinance of 1787, saw legislative consideration of the problem this year. One State--South Dakota--passed a new law that abandons riparion doctrine and substitutes the western system of appropriation for beneficial use. The states of Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland, Missouri, New York, Ohio, and Oklahoma, among others, have new commissions or committees created by their legislatures to study water law revision and related problems. There may be others that have not come to our attention.

In Arkansas, the legislature created a special eleven man committee commission to study surface water right legislation, but made no funds available for the work. North Dakota lawmakers created a state body of water commissioners with emergency powers to divert water and charged with conducting a study of the state's water resources. I think Oklahoma had a committee or a commission of some 32. The general assembly of South Carolina declined, again, to enact the appropriative rights law recommended by the water policy committee created two years ago.

The trend toward revision has been prompted by two basic factors: 1. growing water shortages, and 2. creating a use for irrigation. We talk about water shortages, but we don't talk about quality enough; we talk too much about quantity. Agricultural groups have been anxious to take advantage of a new federal subsidy and federal loan program designed to make irrigation developments less costly. One of these federal aid programs is a small watershed program of which we were talking this morning, spelled out in Public Law 566 and passed by the 83rd Congress in '53. As originally conceived by many of its sponsors, the

small watershed act was supposed to accelerate a program of good land use, soil treatment and run-off control devices such as terraces, contours, cropping, and headwater check dams. The purpose was to hold water in the upland and diminish flood peaks downstream, incidentally, but importantly, increasing the productivity of the land. Indeed, the full and official title of Public Law 566 is "Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act." The law was so written, however, that drainage and irrigation should be encompassed, but it has been so interpreted and so administered that many of the small watershed projects proposed to date have been mostly drainage or irrigation. In contrast to the principle of western reclamation projects, where water uses are supposed to repay the costs, irrigation beneficiaries under the Small Watershed Act may apply for and receive a direct and non-reimbursable subsidy of federal taxpayer's funds. Now the Soil Conservation Service is the Department of Agriculture bureau responsible for running the small watersheds program. The administrators have found rather vague riparion right doctrine a stumbling block to irrigation developments which they want to promote. Landowners diverting water from irrigation upstream might find themselves enjoined by riparion owners downstream. The riparion doctrine inherited from English common law says in brief that a riparion owner has a right to take as much water from a stream as he needs for domestic use, including livestock water, but that he must permit the flow to continue undimished and unpolluted. The Soil Conservation Service has figured prominently in the current movement for water law revision. The name and the advices of the Service's water law specialist, C. E. Busbee, have appeared repeatedly in the various state conferences and publications on that subject. Mr. Busbee served as an unofficial consultant to the South Carolina water policy committee whose proposed new law, although rejected to date by the South Carolina legislature, has been charted as a model in numerous other states. I might add that at the Federation meeting at New

Orleans we invited Mr. Busbee there. He's been very unhappy over what the Federation has had to say about his activities of going into these states and trying to sell them the idea, that is, east of the Mississippi, that they should adopt this western idea of prior appropriations. That was the first time that I can find that he ever declared himself that fish and wildlife had some equity in water, and he's released on public record today. The S.C.S. effort has been directed toward replacing the riparion doctrine with the western doctrine of appropriative rights. In brief, in general terms the western system is that the first person or persons to lay claim to or to appropriate the water gets it so long as the use is continuous and considered beneficial under the law. The appropriative doctrine was developed in the arid west, where water was always scarce and fought over from the earliest days of the settlement. In general, it has worked well although fish and game interests have often found themselves helpless under the law where irrigation users or hydroelectric interests wanted to take the last drop of water in a stream or drain a reservoir dry. In a state like Arizona, for example, the game and fish department usually has to trade for or purchase water rights if it wants to develop a new fishing lake or waterfowl marsh. If water rights cannot be acquired, the fish and game project dies on the planning board. This deficiency occurs, because in the early days no one realized the value of wildlife and the public recreation that it can provide. With few exceptions, the laws of the western states fail completely to recognize wildlife management as a beneficial use of water. In the few exceptions where fish and wildlife is mentioned, it is relegated to the tail end of a priority system. Some recent court decisions, however, have indicated a trend towards other recognitions. The danger to wildlife in eastern states lies in the zealous attempt to impose western doctrine without modification and without safeguards to meet eastern conditions. The touted South Carolina report gave scant consideration to wildlife and recreational values. The key section in

the proposed South Carolina law put the hunter and fisherman way down on the totem pole in these words, "Appropriation of surface water of the state shall not constitute absolute ownership or absolute rights of use of such waters. But such waters shall remain subject to the principle of beneficial use. Where future appropriations of water for different purposes conflict, they shall take precedence in the following order: Namely domestic, municipal, irrigation, industrial, recreation, and waterfowl."

The switch-over to the appropriative doctrine enacted by South Dakota legislature this year wasn't quite as bad as South Carolina proposal, according to information received by the Federation. Even there, recreation was stamped as an inferior use. A priority was established for domestic use including water of livestock first. Municipal was next and almost equal, followed by industrial, irrigation, and then recreational uses. The new South Dakota legislation sets up a water resource commission and seven members are to represent (1) dry land farmers, (2) range livestock producers, (3) municipalities, (4) mining and timber industries, (5) soil conservation districts, (6) drainage districts, and (7) irrigation districts. It gives no representation to recreation or wildlife interests. Public interest in wildlife resources including wildlife and recreational values appears to have better basic protection in those states that have constitutional provisions founded on the famous ordinance of 1787. The ordinance of 1787 was a part of the basic law that created the old Northwest Territory from which some states subsequently were carved. Wisconsin's constitution follows the historic ordinance in declaring that "The River Mississippi and the navigable waters leading into the Mississippi and the St. Lawrence and the carrying places between the same shall be common highways and forever free as well as to the inhabitants to the state as to the citizens of the United States." In essence this provision guarantees the public right to the use of public waters.

Water law revision probably is inevitable and necessary in many states as

competitive pressures mount for dwindling supplies. The Federation raises this question, however: Is it a sound policy to spell out a system of rigid priorities in the statutes giving certain kinds of water for use preferences over other uses? We believe it is a faulty policy and bound to new troubles. It must be recognized that in one locality and situation, irrigation may be the most important use from the standpoint of general economy and public welfare. In another instance municipal or industrial uses may well be predominant. In still other streams or watersheds we suggest the Current river of Missouri and the Allagash of Maine as examples. The recreational and aesthetic values far out-weigh all other from the standpoint of public welfare. Only recently in a celebrated case well known to all conservationists a federal court of appeals sustained the federal power commission in ruling that held fishing and other public recreation to be a more beneficial use of the Namocogen river than a power dam. The matter of water law revision is a problem that needs the immediate and the serious study of conservation agencies and organizations in all your states. The general public has a great deal at stake. Beyond special interests that are jousting for priorities, it isn't likely that agriculture, hydro-electric power or other commercial groups will voluntarily concede the recreational and aesthetic values or take up the cudgel for fish and wildlife. What we actually have here, gentlemen, is a conflict between consumptive users and non-consumptive users. Recreation falls into the category of a non-consumptive use. In all such fights, however, make strange bedfellows. Whereas the sportsman and the hydroelectric interests are often at odds on the building of dams, in this instance they join hands more or less for both desire a constant stream flow. In many states today, as I have just indicated, it is irrigation problems that become the most contentious. Many states, for example, like my own home state, the college of agriculture is leading a very aggressive fight for the farmer against the recreational interests. Yet recreation in that

state is a half billion dollar industry, the recreation and the paper mill industry almost equals agriculture. I can get awfully provoked and cynical at the "holier-than-thou" and the Moses complex of many of our agricultural leaders. I'm not at all adverse to citing some of their sins of the past, which they do not like to hear, for at one time I was a victim of their propaganda. I wish to requote here what some of you heard at the International in Augusta. "The right to examine leadership could well be considered the keystone of democracy. The right to call leadership to account and replace it, if the people desire. When that right is neglected or abrogated, we will no longer have democracy. Too many people, however, fail to realize their responsible interest inherent in the right of a franchise. Leaders can present issues and can fight for or against certain principles. In the end the people must make the final decision and to intelligently do so they must insist on the facts and have the facts. I believe that is the job of this group right here that they have the facts. When the people are ill informed or indifferent, poor leadership, misguided leadership or deceitful leadership will be the result. Misguided leadership can bring about just about as much catastrophe as deceit. It is your right and duty to examine public leadership, and examine our leadership. If you do not exercise that right, the failures are your own responsibility.

I want to point out some of this past leadership. Fifty years ago the three Great Lakes states viewed their cut-over lands as the coming agricultural Utopia of the nation. The land companies and the railroads said so, and most significant, their agricultural colleges said so. I wish to quote from a bulletin of 1915 from Wisconsin. It says this: "About 10 million acres of cut-over land in upper Wisconsin are in the twilight between the lumberman's paradise and the farmer's estate. Beneath a jungle of fallen logs, stumps and treetops is a soil that bids fair to do more for humanity by raising wheat for food than it does logs for lumber." Another of 1917 which quotes the Commissioner of Agriculture. "Practically two-thirds of our state is undeveloped. Neither can

the state of Wisconsin afford to let this great northern empire lie undeveloped." A banker of that time said, "Get as much brush and timber cut down as possible. Money can be obtained for almost nothing."

The agricultural leadership in many parts of the United States advocated clean farming, and row crop tillage up to as much as 30 percent slopes regardless of the effect of erosion. It took big Hugh Bennett, and many millions in subsidies to change that pattern. The battle of soil conservation versus the fast dollar is still a long ways from being won. Furthermore, the original philosophy of the Soil Conservation Service of soil saving has now become an engineering concept of water manipulation and soil utilization.

At the turn of the century, land speculators not content with forcing a farm economy on fine land wholly unsuited for agriculture and still speaking about the Great Lakes states turned to draining vast areas of marsh and peat bog, a further outrage to the land, without rhyme or reason other than visions of profit. Again they were aided and abetted by certain agricultural leadership and engineers who visualized themselves leading the multitudes into a promised land. As examples I cite Kootchigan and Bellframme drainage in Minnesota, the Horicon and the peat bogs country of central Wisconsin, the Seeny area in Michigan, and the WPA, attempt to drain the Looking-glass basin in Michigan. The heartbreak and the bankruptcy that followed those abortions in land use left these agricultural leaders and engineers singularly unmoved, unimpressed by their own mistakes. It was not their heartbreak and it was not their money. These are cases having preached multiple benefits, but having practiced multiple abuses. It takes tremendous abuse to ruin land beyond the point of recovery. In this instance, in spite of continued and devastating fires, with much labor and subsidy, the ecology is slowly being repaired. This is past leadership that I'm talking about. In the above mentioned Lake states the forests are regenerated to foster a sound forest industry, in spite of past leadership. Wildlife

thrives in the woodland enticing the vacation dollar in spite of misdirected leadership of the past. The canals through the burned out peat bogs have been plugged to create some of the most outstanding waterfowl areas in the continent, in spite of misdirected leadership. Watersheds and recaptured marshes preserve the most precious element of life, in spite of past misdirected leadership. Fishing supports one of the most profitable resort businesses in the nation, in spite of misdirected leadership. The economy of those states is stabilized due to sound land ecology, in spite of past misdirected leadership.

They say that a lawyer's mistakes go to the penitentiary and a doctor's mistakes are buried. These agricultural experts of which I speak assume a martyr complex, and an injured air when someone exhumes the bones of their misguided leadership. They want us to forget the past, accept their preachments today with humility, awe, and bended knee. We're supposed to forget these things and go on to accept at face value what they advocate today about wetland drainage and small watersheds. I say, "by their fruits shall ye know them". Every state represented here will have water legislation to deal with next January. I hope this subject will be debated before the International at Toronto. In fact, I have been urging Bruce Stiles to have a half a day panel on it. I might say here that I got an idea today, this morning, and it's not original with me, but I do think this group could consider it. It originates with Bud Morgan and Harry Ruhl, that possibly a standing committee on this subject of water and state laws wherein the International could help a state where they have problems that are so overwhelming possibly legally or some other way. In many respects this business of water is not going to be a national problem altogether, it's going to be a state problem and it's got to be fought on a state basis. I hope that we do have a panel at Toronto, and I hope you give that idea of Morgan's and Ruhl's very serious consideration. Stronger pollution laws are where we've got figure on quality as well as quantity comes into

this. You know actually we don't talk water conservation. No one raises the issue as to how we can curtail needless uses, and no one is stressing clean water. Both industry and the national Chamber of Commerce are unhappy, because the present pollution law was passed and to the best of my knowledge it hasn't been signed by the President yet. That irks me also, when groups like that, for their own interests they call progress will come in and try to defeat good pollution laws. I'm all through bowing and scraping to selfish interest, regardless of who they are and this includes the commercializers of recreation for they are just as cold-bloodedly commercial as any other industry. Gentlemen, I have worked with you people a long time. I want you to know that I'll do everything I can within the power of the Federation to help the regional groups or the International in this problem. I will say again, I don't think there's anything that's going to face you that's got all of the ramifications and heartbreak that you may have in the future on this matter of equitable water use. Instead of having a 50-50, most of your opponents wanted one horse and one rabbit and they don't even want to give you the rabbit. I thank you.

MR. KIMBALL (Colorado):

Thank you, Ernie, for a very fine paper. We'll now throw the meeting open for discussion. Any of you have any comments would you please use the microphone there in the center. Give your name and who you represent. I'm sure the problems in water law that Ernie has pointed out in his paper affects every state, and the state that I happen to represent in the west has that water rights of appropriation.

MR. MORGAN (North Dakota):

I have been interested in water rights for a long, long time due to the fact that we have a situation that is doubtless going to become more important to the public and to those who wish to participate in water recreation in North

Dakota that originated at the time the state was admitted to the Union. At that time there was consideration given to water recreation. In fact the constitution provides that the title to water shall be in the state for three purposes: that of industry, that of irrigation, and that of transportation. Today there are two streams and no lakes, I might say, in the State of North Dakota, to which the public has unrestricted rights; in other words, which are considered state waters. The only way that others can be qualified and classified in those respects is through a court decision determining that the waters are in reality navigable. I recall one case where we were trying to exercise our right of public domain in the state of North Dakota. We proved to the court without a shadow of a doubt that there was a maximum depth of water in this particular lake of 17 feet or better, but because we could not develop proof that those waters had ever been used for navigation, the water was classified as non-navigable water. The adjoining owners under the Supreme Court ruling own the bottom or the stream bottom or the lake bottom, and consequently it follows that they have control over the water which inundates those bottoms. We have a situation which I think can probably be solved only through a national action in amending the constitution. I don't see there is much hope for it in the very near future, due to the fact that we are primarily an agricultural state. We all know, agriculturists are very jealous of their prerogatives and rights in land they have control of. However, that's not going to keep us from trying, from struggling, because North Dakota is a state which is going to become industrialized rather rapidly with the result that I think these things are going to be a little more easily worked out, due to the fact that we will have representation from other walks of life other than agriculture in our legislative body and different interests will be represented through those people. So far as this committee that Ernie mentioned to you, I feel that if it's possible to establish one, and if the International is in a position to be able to run down,

to trace some of the history of our water laws and to make them applicable, or rather to make them available to states that are having these problems, it would be one of the finest contributions that we could make, because it's not just North Dakota and North Dakota's problems. It isn't Minnesota or Ohio or any other individual or particular state. When these decisions are handed down they are quoted by other states as these problems come up. They very definitely have an impact and tend to influence the determinations that are come to by the Supreme Court. So we're not alone in this deal. We either hang together or we hang separately. That's it. Thank you.

MR. KIMBALL (Colorado):

Are there any other comments?

MR. BECKMAN:

I would just like to ask Mr. Swift if his organization has given any actual consideration to drawing up a model law.

MR. SWIFT:

We have gathered a tremendous amount of information from the various states. But when you come to developing a model law, there's so much variation throughout the United States, Ray, that you can't develop a model law for 48 states. You can give them some of the basic thinking of states that are applicable, but as I see it, those interested within the state of Iowa have to be present and fight for an equitable consideration in wildlife. Personally, maybe many of you disagree with me but I think that this idea of rigid priorities isn't going to work either, because industry changes, and farming changes. When you make it rigid it's usually applicable to whole states, and I think it should be more flexible.

MR. KIMBALL:

Any other comments? If not, we'll pass on to our next paper. We'd like

to break in here, however, and introduce to you Mr. Max McGraw. Most of you know Mr. McGraw is a member of the Illinois Conservation Advisory Board, the founder and owner of the Fin and Feather Club, and who is currently building a series of ponds for fisheries research in cooperation with the Illinois Department of Conservation, the Natural History Survey, and the Wildlife Management Institute. He is also the president of the American Wildlife Foundation. We are happy to have you here, Mr. McGraw.

The next paper is to be presented by Mr. M. O. Steen, formerly of Missouri, who is now the Director of the Nebraska Game, Forestation and Parks Commission on the "Cooperative Exchanges of Game Birds, Animals and Fish Between States". Mr. Steen.

MR. STEEN (Nebraska):

Thank you, Tom. I've been much interested in the previous discussion and I didn't want to take up time then, speaking on it, but I do want to say that I believe the problem is a very serious one and I would like to make just this one comment. Approximately three-fourths of the earth's surface is water, one-fourth of it is land. I believe the good Lord made the earth that way, because that is the relative value and significance of those two resources. Water is the most important resource that we possess and it certainly merits very serious consideration.

I have no paper, Tom. The last few weeks have been so full that I have no chance to prepare one. So I want to talk to you just extemporaneously this afternoon about this assigned subject. I think we can start the discussion by making the assertion that the cooperative exchange of game birds, animals, and fish between states is a necessity; in fact it is imperative in modern wildlife management.

Then I think we can go on to point out why that is true. We all seek, of course, to provide a greater supply of wildlife for our customers. In that

effort we have problems: the problems of production, and that of maintaining wildlife supplies. I think we can say that environment is the key to the welfare and abundance of all forms of life, including wildlife. We can divide the environment we work with into two categories: lands and waters. Then again, we can divide the land, and I'm speaking now in general terms, divide the land into two categories: mainly the forest lands and the prairie lands. The waters that we work with we can divide into two categories: primarily the natural streams and impoundments of the nation, and the man-made reservoirs and impoundments that we work with. In each one of those rather broad classifications of environment we have species of wildlife that are pursued by man either for sport or for profit and which are the resources that we try to manage.

A good many things have happened and are happening to these environments. Generally speaking, these changes that occur due to our use of these resources for production of food, fibre, and other purposes are not as great in our waters as on the land. On the land the changes we have wrought are catastrophic insofar as wildlife is concerned. In the water the changes are material, too, but not as great, perhaps, as on the land. The principle thing we have done with our water is generally to reduce the carrying capacity of those waters we do possess and to offset that by the creation, the construction of impoundments and the creation of added acreage in which we can produce fish life.

Now then, we will discuss briefly, the land and the problems we face on the land. I said that the changes on the prairie lands are catastrophic and that is true. I should like to point out to you that in nature we normally have in any geographical range conditions, we call climax. They are conditions created by Nature and depending primarily on the climate of the area. We have soil types on which Nature grows, if left to her own devices, a certain association of plants and animals. Those are the native or indigenous species.

Those are the plants and animals we found here when we came along with our cow, and our plow, and our match, and our mower, and set about changing all those things over. I should like to point out to you briefly, how catastrophic the change has been. I should like to point out to you that on our prairie lands, which are our most fertile lands and where we grow the food and fibre that support this nation, there is scarcely a single native American plant used, at least none are used to any great degree. Actually, of all the cultivated crops we grow in America, there are only three that are North American or American: corn, which was not native actually to this range or to the range we work in but which was a tropical plant that has been brought northward by acclimation; tomato and tobacco. Those are the only three native plants we have. Everything else is exotic out there: your wheat, your oats, your barley, your rye, your clover, your alfalfa, everything you grow. In the state where I used to work, Missouri, the native and the dominant grass of the prairies was bluestem. It's very difficult to find bluestem, anymore, in Missouri. It's almost gone. Now it's not surprising, then, that these catastrophic changes have a great impact upon the animals that are adapted to live in the environment and under the conditions that we have so greatly altered.

There are two reasons, basically, why we have lost indigenous game resources: 1. this catastrophic change in environment which has reduced our ability to produce, and 2. overharvest. Now overharvest actually was true and has been true primarily of the larger and more spectacular species. The big game animals. Those species which were big enough and particularly where the economic incentive was involved, where we could go out and kill them and market them, were big enough and valuable enough to induce the individual to pursue the species down to virtually the last animal, because it was worth his while to put in the man hours of effort that was necessary to kill that last buck deer, that last elk, or that last bison. That has not been so true of the lesser species: the

rabbits and the quail and the others are not, in general, overharvested. We have lost our populations there because of our environmental changes.

So we must seek answers. Now there appears to be two logical approaches to these problems. One, of course, is to restore, if we can, the species we have lost. The other is to try to find some animal which may not be indigenous, but may have the ability to survive and do well under the new order of things, and in the new environment we have created. A typical example of the latter is the ringneck pheasant, which today is the backbone of upland shooting in probably half of this nation. A completely exotic bird, a bird that probably could not have even existed under climax conditions, but which today does very well in the manmade environment we have created. The ringneck pheasant lives in a man-made environment and in fact the early introduction of the bird back in the days of Benjamin Franklin failed entirely, primarily because our environment had not yet reached the stage which made it possible for the bird to survive and do well. So we have to consider the possibility of exotics and if one of us find a desirable and useful exotic then, we should share that stock with other states, if they have use for it. The second thing is we may find it desirable and possible to restore an indigenous species that may have been exterminated by reasons of overharvest, or which may have been virtually wiped out by reason of environmental changes which are now progressing back toward climax conditions. I think it's safe to say that we have there two categories again: our forest lands and our prairie lands. Our prairie lands are being more and more intensively used all the time. We're progressing further and further away from climax conditions on our prairie lands. They are our most fertile lands. They are the lands upon which we produce our food and fibre, upon which we are going to produce more food and fibre in the future. On those lands which are primarily adapted to the production of trees, the forest crop, we have decided that the best use is to manage them for forests and there we tend back toward climax conditions. Oh,

we're not going all the way back, but we can go back in that direction. So that on those lands we have, in recent times, created conditions and environments which are somewhat closer to the original set of conditions, somewhat closer to the climax conditions which existed there and in which ranges we may be able to restore species that were eliminated by reason of either overharvest or environmental change. For example, in the case of the ruffed grouse and in the case of the wild turkey. The ruffed grouse brings to mind a thought that I should like to express here and that is the fact that many of our indigenous species in America do not have the capacity or the ability to adapt to very great environmental changes. In my humble opinion that is particularly true of our grouse. I refer specifically, not specifically but generally to all the grouse. It doesn't make much difference whether you're talking about ruffed grouse, blue grouse, sooty grouse of the forests, the pinnated grouse, the sharp-tail grouse, the sage grouse, or the prairie lands. Their ability to survive much environmental change is very limited, and that is probably the principle reason why we have pheasants today in the ranges where we used to have prairie chicken and sharp-tail. But now, our other species which have the ability to survive considerable environmental change and in fact which do better under some environmental change. The quail, the bobwhite quail are examples. You know the peak of our bobwhite quail range in America occurred in the days of the split rail fence, the osage orange hedge row, and catch all farming. We're considerably past that now and so our populations of bobwhite quail have declined substantially, but that period saw more bobwhite quail in America than ever existed here, I'm sure, during climax conditions. These environmental changes are not necessarily detrimental, but, as I say, on the prairie lands they tend to continue on and accelerate and move further and further away from original climax conditions. This will always be a problem for managers.

Well, what do we do about it? We try to restore and reintroduce those native

species, those indigenous species which may be able to re-establish themselves in these ranges, which may have been overharvested and by reason of much better law enforcement and much better management today, we can restore or because the environment is still capable of carrying that species. For example, in the case of the white-tail deer and the mule deer, we try to find some species that we can introduce and which will do well under the new order of things.

Now, I think it is generally true in this area that is represented by these 13 states and two Canadian provinces that are members of this association that we have no particular trouble or problem in exchanging game birds, animals and fish as between each other. Yet, I have noted in my day that there is considerable reluctance or even some impossibility to effect free exchange of stock between states in some or out of some sections of the nation. The management agency has public sentiment with respect to the exportation of native game to work with and are reluctant to incur the displeasure of their customers by sending game out of the state. Now, that is a feeling, a sentiment, a thought, a concept that we must overcome. If everybody who had game of any kind sat on it and adopted a dog in a manger attitude and said "None of this is going out of here," none of us would do very well. We wouldn't even have any feathers on the market today, if that were true. None of us would have deer, a lot of us wouldn't have other species we have today, which are valuable additions to our wildlife resources.

I have noted, too, that it is frequently much easier to get eggs, let's say, of a given species out of state than it is to get the young or the adult of that same species. So, I just throw that out as a thought for your consideration. If you're unable to get hold of a bird, perhaps you can get its eggs without incurring the displeasure of the public in the state from which it is exported.

Now, in the field of fish, of course, we don't have too much difficulty, apparently, in the exchange of species and stock. Many of the states here and Canadian provinces are very generous. When I say states, I refer to the provinces

just as well as the states. I think of them in the same category. Particularly such species as walleye and others that are imported in some of the more southerly states from the northerly states and the more easterly states, Ohio, Minnesota and other states have been very generous in supplying some of the rest of us with walleye eggs from stock. Canada too has been very generous in supplying states along our northern border with eggs. Yet, as an interested in recent months and the last couple of years in the possibility that the striped bass which lives along the Atlantic seaboard and down around the gulf over about as far as the Mississippi or just east of the Mississippi, that it might be introduced in and do well in inland waters. I think it's pretty well established now that the striped bass does have the ability to live out its life cycle in fresh water, and it does not necessarily have to return to salt water in order to complete the life cycle. That's pretty well demonstrated, I believe.

During my work for the state of Missouri I explored the possibility of getting some stock out of those eastern states and even though many of them were permitting the commercialization of striped bass, yet they were exceedingly reluctant to export any striped bass for stocking purposes in the interior apparently because they felt that their public might resent it. I think that's one of the problems we have to work with and that we should try to overcome, because as I have said previously, the free exchange of game birds, animals, and fish between states is a necessity in modern wildlife management. Then, there is this possibility that we can find an exotic species that will do well in the modified environments we are creating, and if any of us find such a species and succeed with it that we certainly should make it available to other states who can use it. I think perhaps the most outstanding example of that, or how to approach that problem is the experience, or performance of Missouri with respect to the Coturnix quail. Now, in the bobwhite quail range of America, we have essentially the same problem as I have referred to with respect to the prairie

grouse in the northern and western sections of the country. The prairie grouse did not have the ability to adapt to the environmental changes that were going on, therefore we brought in a very successful substitute, the pheasant. The bobwhite quail has substantially more ability to adapt to environmental changes, but even so, the peak of environment for the bobwhite quail has passed and we are on the decline all over the bobwhite quail range. If we could find some species that would do in the bobwhite quail range like the pheasant did in the prairie grouse range, it would be a very valuable addition to upland resources. The Coturnix quail appears to offer a possibility in that direction. The state of Missouri was able to secure stock and breed the birds very successfully in captivity. This was made available, I believe, to some 14 states and one Canadian province, the breeding stock of that bird. It will be released simultaneously all over that range which covers, roughly, the southeastern and eastern sections of the United States and on up as far as the province of Ontario. And we ought to get a pretty good test. I don't think anyone has any way of knowing whether the bird will succeed or not. If he should succeed and do in the quail range what the pheasant did in the prairie chicken range, it would be a jackpot deal for all of us.

Well, that essentially sums up this assigned subject and I want to repeat what I have said previously: that the cooperative exchange of game birds, game animals, and fish between states is a necessity, and in fact, imperative in modern wildlife management. We have serious problems to solve and none of us can solve them by working alone. We must work together, we must marshal our knowledge, in order that we may try to find solutions to these problems that are being created by the march of man across the land. Thank you.

MR. KIMBALL:

Thank you, Mr. Steen. Is there any discussion on the comments Mr. Steen has made?

I might pose one question here to the administrators. I know the sportsmen of our state seem to be a curious lot, but they're never quite satisfied with the indigenous species that they have. You, if they go to Wisconsin and catch a muskie or pike or something, when they come back they're all hot for getting muskie and pike, even in some of our best trout waters. In the same way, if they go to Africa and kill an ibex and come back to Colorado, all of a sudden we've got to have ibex. We've had everything from that proposed to pygmy deer that come from Kenya colony in Africa. I'm wondering whether or not the administrators feel that sufficient investigation is being placed on introduction of species, which are not indigenous to their particular state. Is it being done on a more or less hit and miss method, do you feel, or is there sufficient investigational work going along with it? Mr. Bode, would you like to comment?

MR. BODE:

No, I don't think there is. I think there is investigation work going on. I think under the concept that Mr. Steen gave us here it's rather an infant in swaddling clothes. As Mr. Steen knows, when we started on this Coturnix thing, we all insisted that, if it was going to be worth anything at all it had to be a thorough job. It's been rather expensive for us, but it will not be too expensive if it proves right. I think that from the top down, from the Fish and Wildlife Service on down, they've got to broaden their concept about the value of this thing so it can be put on a more thoroughly tested basis. That was the reason for my original answer.

MR. OLDS (Ohio):

I'd like to call attention to what Mr. Steen said about the agricultural products which are grown in this nation today, most of them having been imported from some other continent. Well, now, along with those agricultural products it seems to have brought in most of the insects that fed upon them and we have a

great many pests brought along with them. Then, I'd also call your attention to the number of people that must be abroad at the expense of this government searching for plants of one kind or another to bring into this country and possibly also livestock of one kind or another. When you compare that with the efforts of one man that the Fish and Wildlife Service has working on that abroad, it comes back to the request that has been made by the states, by the International, and so forth the Fish and Wildlife Service gives more effort and time to that sort of thing.

MR. KIMBALL:

That poses another very interesting problem. Should we, if we have a species that's indigenous to the state that's doing, let's say, not too well, but then environmental change is not too great, should we attempt the introduction of exotics under those conditions? Or should we develop the environment and habitat of that particular species that is indigenous and improve it rather than attempt a substitute? That also comes into the picture, doesn't it?

MR. STEFN:

Tom, I'll try to answer your question first. I personally do not consider the hazards, particularly of the game bird, that has been well studied and which is being introduced a hazard of its replacing or pushing out an indigenous species as being very great. It has been my observation that, if one species exists in a range and survives and prospers and another one declines, it is because the environment makes it that way and not because one species is pushing the other one out. I think that when we get to moving, playing around with mammals, we're playing with something which is far more dangerous and far more hazardous. But, generally speaking, in the species that we would work with, I don't think we need to worry quite so much about what one exotic species might do to a native species, if we stay in the field that we ought to stay in.

I would like to comment, however, on the question that Hayden raised. For quite a number of years, I was chairman of the committee on the introduction of exotics for the International Association. I well recall the original resolutions from the original concept of that thing. That concept was that the Fish and Wildlife Service would send abroad teams and would explore the possibilities of desirable species that could do these things that we were talking about. There should be a minimum of two teams used in this work; in other words, four men. That work has been going on since about 1949, I believe. There never has been more than one full-time man on that work and he can't do very much about it. Now with respect to hazards, I would like to point out that all the work that has been done, under the direction of Dr. Bump for the work that the Service is doing has been pretty well done. Considerable care has been exercised in selection of species and I doubt that we are sticking our neck out very far on any that have been brought in under those conditions, but that the real hazard in introduction lies in the volume, the big volume of introductions that are made by private sources. I remember when we brought in something like 600 birds through the port at New York. Under Dr. Bump there were more than 8,000 exotics brought in, maybe 20 or 25 species brought in through that same port during that same period for release by private sources in the United States and Canada. That's just one port of importation into this country. A hazard with respect to introduction lies in the unregulated practice of introductions, and not in the rather well worked out and thought out efforts that the various departments may be making. Now, once in a while you see a department that sort of gets off on a tangent and brings in something like the wild boar or some similar animal that maybe is a pretty good game animal that is going to give us considerable headache insofar as agriculture is concerned. Generally speaking, we have not so much to fear from our own activities, our official activities, but probably considerable to fear from the unofficial activities of the unofficial wildlife

managers of America.

MR. KIMBALL:

Time will not permit any further discussion on this subject, so without further ado, I will introduce our next speaker, Mr. William B. Barnes of the Indiana Department of Conservation, who will present a paper on "Is a Special Fee Justified to Hunt and Fish on State Operated Public Use Areas?" Mr. Barnes.

MR. BARNES (Indiana):

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The subject of charging fees to sportsmen for hunting and fishing on state operated public use areas becomes more important as hunting pressure increases. Leasing of land becomes more prevalent and our hunters and fishermen vie for opportunities to better enjoy their sport. From the increase in urban population it is evident that land owned by state and federal agencies will be particularly sought by this group as a place to enjoy their outdoor sport. It is believed that pressure for acquiring more public land and providing suitable hunting and fishing opportunities is just now being felt in many parts of the midwest. Therefore, a questionnaire was sent out to several of the states. The feasibility of charging special fees for such privileges may be expected to become more pronounced as time goes by.

Now this questionnaire was sent to all the member states and provinces within the Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners' area. We received answers from 10 states and one province. These answers came from Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin, Kansas, Illinois, Minnesota, Iowa, Nebraska, Ohio, Missouri and Ontario. State-owned public areas were divided into three groups, namely: state fish and game areas, state forests and state parks. No effort was made to include federal ownership such as land owned by the U. S. Forest Service and the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. It was also found that, due to the different state procedures for buying and classifying land under different state agencies, it was quite

difficult to even segregate state-owned property. Some states lease large acreages for public hunting grounds and have land classified as county forest lands, private forest crop lands, state loan commission lands, trust fund lands, classified forests and so forth. For the most part, the information included will deal only with state-owned fish and game areas, state forests, and state parks.

At the present time, only four of the answering states indicated fees were charged to hunt. Fees included Indiana, Kansas, Illinois, and Missouri, with a total of 23 different areas being represented. As for charges for fishing, Indiana and Missouri are the only two states reporting charges on a total of 10 different areas. Practically all of the state forest lands in the states answering the questionnaire were shown to be open to unlimited hunting and fishing, with no charges being made. Indiana, Michigan, and Ontario listed hunting in some state forests. However, most of these areas are refuges wherein all wildlife species are protected. In Indiana, two state parks have been used for limited archery seasons on deer. These areas are also quite popular from the fishing standpoint, and no charge is being made unless rental boats are provided. Every state that charged a fee for hunting solely justified this action for facilities provided such as boats, blinds, pits, and stock game. Indiana, Kansas, Illinois, Missouri, and one area in Wisconsin listed charges for such facilities. The same justifications applied for fishing charges where facilities were provided such as boat rentals. Michigan, Ohio, Minnesota, Iowa, Nebraska, and Ontario evidently make no charges for hunting. Whether they furnish no facilities or provide them free of charge could not be determined from the questionnaire. The opinion of answering states and provinces on whether hunting charges should be made regardless of whether additional facilities were provided was next asked. Although one province did not charge for facilities, they were not opposed to other states doing so. One state was of the opinion that such charges would be justified, even if facilities were not provided, while the remaining

states were against such charges.

Practically all of the questionnaires showed opposition to any charges for fishing, if no facilities were provided. Some were of the opinion that charging for fishing or hunting would be the last resort and used only in the case of other funds not being available. Five states stock state-owned shooting areas with the ringneck pheasant being the only species involved. Two states carry on this activity daily during the pheasant season, while another makes pre-season and in-season releases. The other states simply carry on routine stocking in accordance with statewide practices.

In regard to limiting the daily number of nimrods, four states limit the number of hunters on areas, while two states have a limit on some areas and none on others. Five states do not have any restrictions. Many of these restrictions are evidently in effect on waterfowl areas, where a definite number of blinds are available. Other limitations exist on upland game hunting areas, primarily where the areas are so small that it is necessary to limit the number of participants as a safety measure. In one state where it was desirable to reduce the wildlife population on a refuge, the number of participants was also limited to control the total harvest.

Another question was asked regarding the policy of stocking stateowned fishing areas excluding natural lakes and streams adjoining private land. All of the states and provinces with one exception stock such areas usually with the same procedure and stocking rates as described by aquatic biologists for other water areas in the state. This was particularly true for warm water species. Usually, where any special fishing regulations were enforced or where fees were involved, this primarily pertained to trout released on a put and take basis. In one state, large bullheads and carp were stocked on a put and take basis.

Another question of specific interest was hunting on state-owned areas acquired with federal aid funds. Indiana, Kansas, Illinois, and Missouri stated

that fees were charged on such lands while Michigan, Minnesota, Iowa, Nebraska, and Ohio made no such charges on this land that had been acquired with federal aid funds. In Wisconsin charges were made for goose hunting on the federal portion of the Horicon Marsh. The provinces in Canada, of course, do not receive any similar federal aid funds. The new federal aid manual defines, and I quote, "If special fees are charged for the privilege of hunting on management areas, such as state-owned and developed water areas, the hunting fees collected should be used to the extent required to pay the salaries and expenses of project personnel assigned to collect these fees and supervise the hunt." At the present time, five states are now using this management system. In regard to future use of the system, one other state plans to use it. Two states may possibly use it, while two others indicate that they plan no future participation. One state gave no indication on future plans. Information was asked only on total acreage on state owned fish and game areas. As previously stated, however, a number of different ownerships were included by some of the states. By separating the recordable data from nine states, it is found that there is a total of 4,391,234 acres in state owned fish and game lands. Minnesota accounted for the bulk of this amount with over three million acres listed.

In summary, it would appear that the present trend of thinking concerning the charging of fees for hunting and fishing on state operated public use areas should be solely justified on facilities provided such as boats, blinds, pits, stock games, and so forth. There appears to be practically a unanimous opinion that otherwise such privileges for the sportsmen should be at no charge. It is of interest to note, that some states believe that charging should be the last resort and only practiced where other funds are not available. More than likely, areas on which fees are charged may be more popular near urban centers where good fishing and hunting is difficult to find. It is evident that such areas in most states will continue to supply only a small portion of the total fishing and

hunting efforts expended on a statewide basis, particularly as it pertains to small upland game. Large publicly owned areas such as state and federal forests on which no fees are charged will continue to provide much free hunting range.

MR. KIMBALL:

Thank you, Mr. Barnes, for an important paper. We have a few minutes for discussion. Anyone care to ask a question?

MR. ELKINS (Fish and Wildlife Service):

I would like to ask Mr. Barnes if the purpose of the fees in his questionnaires was for revenue, or if it was to control the hunters and control the numbers? Did you get information on the purpose of charging the fees?

MR. BARNES:

Well, the fees, as it was answered by the questionnaire, was simply to take care of boat rentals and expenditures on the areas. As I pointed out, none of the states were in favor of charging any fees, unless it would be for providing boats, blinds, or some other special facilities.

MR. KIMBALL:

How about clean-up? Would there be any expense involved in just cleaning up the trash and so forth? Did you mention that in your questionnaire?

MR. BARNES:

No, that was not mentioned in the questionnaire. In Indiana we do not go into the picnic areas or any public facilities. I know that it would be quite a major item as you do in some of your states.

MR. KIMBALL:

Any other questions?

MR. BODE:

I can't help injecting a comment here, for thought. The way the report read I believe we were classified in those states that made charges for facilities furnished. Now, on a number of our areas we do have facilities available. Those facilities are made available at an additional cost, but there is a general charge made for use of the area. The purpose for that is not to produce revenue, but we have this concept of those areas: the more nearly we can make those special areas carry their annual operating load the more of those areas we can provide for the people. We can see the time where the actual number of those areas that can be provided will be stopped, because the operating load has pyramided to the point where the department can't carry any more of it.

MR. BARNES:

Mr. Elkins, would you like to comment on this federal aid management feature as it is in the new manual?

MR. ELKINS:

Well, I think as all the members know here, the provision of actual hunting facilities was not possible under the P-R Act until it was amended to include management, and now that is possible under the management feature. It has that limitation on it of 30%. I don't know just what you want there, Bill, except are you talking about the plow-back of any of the money?

The basis for saying in the manual that if fees are charged they should be plowed back into the operation of the area to the extent required is on the basis that the Act limits participation of federal money to 75%. In short, if the thing is entirely operated as a federal aid project, then the proportion spent on this managing the hunt would have to be plowed into it. If, on the other hand, the state is managing the thing out of their own funds and the other portion of the manager's time is on federal aid activities, it wouldn't be required. That would

be the simplest and the cleanest way to handle it.

MR. KIMBALL:

I'm sorry that time will not permit any further discussion. This conference, of course, wouldn't be complete unless we heard from our friends and neighbors from the north in Canada. I now turn the mike over to Dr. W. J. K. Harkness of Ontario. He will discuss "The Importance of Rabies in Wildlife Management". He will be followed by Dr. E. D. Martin of the Ohio Division of Wildlife. Dr. Harkness.

DR. HARKNESS (Ontario):

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen. It is certainly a very great privilege for us to come to Illinois to this meeting. We're seeing a lot of new and interesting things for the first time. It's interesting to see your corn grow. And when I say see it grow I mean that quite literally. When we drove into Indiana-Illinois yesterday and had a very, very excellent guide in the person of George Sprecker who apparently knows as much about Illinois as he does Wisconsin, pointed out all the highlights as we came along. Speaking about the corn growing: when we entered Illinois yesterday the corn was about that high. When we got down here it was about that high. I had no realization of the rate it grew down here. I wonder what it's going to look like when we leave. But as we drove along and saw this terrific corn I was wondering what the people of Texas do when they drive up through Illinois. It sure must rub them the wrong way, because they've got a lot of big things they talk about down there. When they see this grass up here that must be something for them.

I would like to remind you all that the American Fisheries Society and International Association meetings are to be in Toronto, Ontario, September the 10th to the 14th this year and to extend to each and all of you a very hearty invitation to be with us at that time. The meetings are in Toronto, Ontario and

I suggest that you get your reservations at the earliest possible time, because I think we're going to have a very large meeting. I don't want to see any of you people looking for rooms after they're all gone.

On this question of rabies, I have a prepared paper. The paper carries my name and the title and Mr. Secretary, I'd like to draw your attention to the fact that when that goes in the transactions, if they are to be printed and I will write you further about this, but I'd like this to go in the records definitely now. I want this paper to appear under the joint authorship of Mr. David Fowle and myself, because Dave wrote the paper. I had a little bit to do with it, so I'm not too reluctant to accept joint authorship with him.

In our own department, in connection with the rabies problem, we have a working committee consisting of Dr. Carp and myself on the administrative angle, and Dave Fowle with Dr. Fythe who is our veterinarian. The research branch and the four of us constitute a working committee. We have done a great deal of planning for general publicity and education. What Dave has included in this paper is the working plan for Ontario, which is the only thing we're competent to speak about. We've had very close cooperation in this working committee including the representatives of the Health of Animals branch of the Department of Agriculture and representatives of the Ontario Department of Health, because as you all know, this is a three-way project. It must be, I think, under every administration that has to deal with rabies with the public health or the health department, the agricultural department and where it involves wildlife with the game department. This is the reason that it is a joint paper and why Dave Fowle from the research branch actually put down the words that I'm going to give you now.

Joint authorship of W. J. K. Harkness, Chief, Division of Fish and Wildlife, and C.D. Fowle, Research Division, Ontario Department of Lands and Forests.

RABIES IN WILDLIFE POPULATIONS

W. J. K. Harkness, Chief,
Division of Fish and Wildlife
Ontario Department of Lands and Forests

(A paper presented before the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners, July, 1956, Springfield, Illinois.)

Although rabies has been known since ancient times as a disease of man, dogs and other domestic animals, it is only recently that its wide-spread occurrence in wild animals has been reported. The identification of rabies during the past few years in enzootic and epizootic proportions in wildlife in many areas in North America raises problems, both administrative and technical, relative to wildlife management, public health and the health of domestic animals. In discussing some of these problems and suggesting a few principles which may be helpful in dealing with them, I will draw particularly upon our experience in Ontario.

Prior to 1952 rabies in Canada occurred sporadically and was limited principally to domestic dogs. Occurrences of the disease were generally traceable to the undetected importation of infected dogs into the country. Outbreaks were reported as early as 1907 in Manitoba and Saskatchewan. In 1910 we had an outbreak in southern Ontario in the Niagara region, and since then there have been sporadic occurrences in the Province until the last one in the Windsor area in 1942. Fatal diseases in dogs and Arctic foxes, having the symptoms of rabies, have been reported in the Northwest Territories for about 100 years, but it was not until 1947 that rabies was diagnosed from the region (Plummer, 1947 a & b). Since then the disease has been recorded from all the western Provinces, Quebec, and more recently from Ontario. Moreover, the pattern of the spread of the disease in many of the occurrences in the Provinces, particularly the outbreaks that began in Alberta in 1952 and in Ontario in 1954, suggests that it came southward from the Northwest Territories. These latter outbreaks are of particular significance because in contrast to previous occurrences of rabies in Canada, several

species of wild mammals, principally red foxes rather than dogs were and are the disseminators of the infection. Consequently, rabies as it presently occurs in Canada generally and in Ontario particularly, must now be considered a wildlife problem.

The first indication that rabies was recurring in Ontario came in March, 1954, when it was diagnosed in two foxes collected at Moosonee and Albany at the southern end of James Bay in northern Ontario. No further cases were reported until eight months later, when in November rabies was diagnosed in a fox from Fauquier, about 150 miles southeast of the southern end of James Bay. Since this time and until June 30, 1956, a period of 20 months, 224 cases of rabies have been diagnosed in the Province. Of this number 166 or 74% have been in wildlife and 58 or 26% in domestic animals. Of the occurrences in wildlife in Ontario approximately 63% of the cases have been in red fox, although the disease has also been recorded from lynx, red squirrel, raccoon, and wolf. In domestic animals, dogs, cats, cattle, sheep, hogs and horses have been affected.

In the 13 months following the first case at Fauquier 84 cases were recorded, practically all within a relatively small area in northeastern Ontario and in the extreme north along the shore of Hudson Bay.

In November, 1955, 12 months after the case at Fauquier, a case was identified at Sudbury, about 200 miles to the south. Soon after, in December, the first case in southern Ontario was diagnosed in a fox near Lindsay, about 200 miles southeast of Sudbury and 60 miles northeast of Toronto. Thus, since the summer of 1954, the disease has spread southward over 600 miles in 20 months, and about 225 cases have been reported from an area about twice as large as the State of Illinois.

Although the present outbreak in Ontario is, in terms of the numbers of confirmed cases, the most serious we know of in Canada, it does not compare with the situation in New York State or in the southern and southeastern United States. In New York State rabies has been present since 1944, mainly in a restricted area in

the south-central part of the State from which several thousand cases have been reported in wild and domestic animals. Other aspects of our situation may be contrasted to those in other areas. The principle animal involved in Ontario is apparently the red fox. In some regions it is the gray fox, skunk, raccoon and, particularly in the south and southwest, in various species of bats.

Although the story in Ontario may not be exactly typical of the situation over the continent, it will serve as an example of the pattern of events confronting most wildlife administrators who must deal with rabies. The problem is: what do we do about it?

As administrators responsible for the wildlife resources, we have a dual responsibility in dealing with rabies. First, we must assess the effects of rabies on the wildlife population, and second, we must develop a close active liaison with the public health authorities and those responsible for the health of domestic animals.

Let us consider the first function. In a fatal disease such as rabies we may expect a decline in the population of the species principally affected. In Ontario our officers report from the north that there was a drastic and dramatic decline in foxes in the area first infected. The fact that no new cases in any species have been reported from the area for six months suggests that the reduction in rabies is directly related to the reduction in foxes. Although rabies has not until recently been recognized as a widespread disease in wild animals, we can hardly conclude that it has only recently invaded wild hosts. It seems more likely that it has escaped attention in wild animals. It seems certain that it has been present for many years in the Canadian Arctic and that fox populations have been decimated from time to time and have recovered. So far wildlife managers have counted on the high potential for recovery in most species to restore populations following epidemics and since, generally speaking, important game and fur species are not known to have been involved, extensive management procedures

have not been developed to suppress rabies in wildlife.

In dealing with rabies as a problem of wildlife management, we are at once struck by a lack of fundamental knowledge and the consequent need for research. Not all problems can be mentioned, but a few may be cited as examples. It is generally stated that rabies is a fatal disease and it undoubtedly is if the essential parts of the brain are attacked. But do we know for sure that it is impossible for a natural immunity to develop as a result of a localized infection that does not reach the brain? Are there such things as attenuated or mutant strains of virus which can impart immunity without giving rise to the typical symptons? Is it possible that there are foxes in northern Ontario who have developed a natural immunity but may still be able to transmit the disease?

The general restriction of rabies to a few species, when it is known to be capable of infecting many, as well as its apparent selectivity in infecting mainly one species in one area and another species in another area, clearly indicates the existence of "strains" of virus similar to those now recognized in viruses affecting man and domestic animals. What are the carriers of these strains? What is the role of rodents and other small mammals in transmitting rabies? Is it possible that strains endemic in reservoir species may mutate and become adapted to foxes or other hosts in which we have come to expect the disease?

There are challenging problems relating to the distribution of the disease. In New York State rabies is found mainly in foxes and restricted to a relatively small area in a few counties, in spite of the fact that the fox population beyond the affected area is as great or greater than within. What are the possible restrictive factors here? Why did rabies in Ontario spread southward rather than westward? Are there restrictive factors to the west of the infected area?

We may now turn to the problem of public health and the health of animals. In this area the wildlife administrator is a partner with the authorities responsible for the protection of public health and that of domestic animals, but

he does not bear the major responsibility. In Canada rabies is a reportable disease under the Animal Contagious Diseases Act and as such diagnosis and control are the responsibility of the Federal Department of Agriculture. In Ontario we we have worked closely with the Canadian Department of Agriculture, Health of Animals Division, and the Provincial Public Health and Agricultural authorities in their control program. Our role in the partnership has been to collect specimens and information in the field which have been made available for examination by the pathologists of the Health of Animals Division. We have advised on problems relating to the behaviour and habits of wild animals and on the feasibility of trapping and poisoning programs to reduce wild populations. We have provided our staff with information on rabies which they, in turn, have used to deal intelligently with situations in local areas both in collecting specimens and information, and in their public relation program. We have, of course, been a major benefactor in the arrangement in that the Health of Animals Division has made all the laboratory diagnoses and supplied us promptly with reports on their findings.

We found that it is very important to keep the field staff of our Department well-informed on the nature of the disease, the methods for combatting it and the progress of the outbreak. Regardless of the legal status of responsibility for control, the public inevitably turns to its wildlife agency when wildlife rabies is present. A well-informed field staff can answer questions intelligently and gain the confidence of the public in a situation in which a good deal of public hysteria may develop.

In his relations with those concerned with public health and the safety of domestic animals the wildlife administrator may have to deal with two questions. First, he will have to decide how much money is to be spent by his own organization in relation to rabies; and second, he will have to assess the feasibility of controlling wild populations in order to more certainly assure the protection of the public and domestic animals. So far as the first problem is concerned it seems

reasonable that expenditures by wildlife agencies for the control of rabies should be directly related to the importance of rabies to wildlife. While wildlife agencies are inevitably drawn into any sort of control program designed to protect human and domestic animals, they should not be called upon to pay the bill for a program which is essentially outside their responsibility.

With regard to the suppression of wild populations in order to reduce the incidence of rabies, it can be said that generally speaking efforts to control wild populations for any reason have, with a few exceptions, been unsuccessful. In those areas such as New York State and Pennsylvania and Alberta, where trapping or poisoning have been instituted, large numbers of animals have been killed, but in the absence of a check area as a basis of comparison, the effect of the programs in reducing rabies is difficult to assess. In Ontario, with red foxes distributed over the whole Province and concentrated in fairly dense populations on the agricultural areas in the south, we questioned the feasibility of effectively altering the population by trapping. We believe poisoning programs in areas of dense human populations are too difficult to control to risk using them. Moreover, the reproductive capacity of the species concerned must be considered. The studies of Layne and McKeon (1956) in New York State show that over 60% of the red and gray foxes in the State could be harvested annually without reducing the potential for complete recovery of the population.

From these considerations we may conclude that in dealing with rabies the wildlife administrator must keep before him, first, the need for more knowledge of the importance of rabies in wild populations as a basis for dealing with rabies as a problem in wildlife management, and, secondly, his responsibility to his colleagues responsible for the health of the general public and domestic animals. In dealing with the problem from the point of view of wildlife and in promoting research he has a primary responsibility. In relation to public health and the health of domestic animals he plays a secondary but essential role.

References

Layne, J. N. and W. H. McKeon, 1956
Some aspects of red fox and gray fox reproduction in New York.
New York Fish and Game Journal. 3: 44-74.

Plummer, P. J. G., 1947 a
Preliminary note on Arctic dog disease and its relationship to rabies.
Canadian Journal of Comparative Medicine.
11: 154-160.

Plummer, P. J. G., 1947 b
Further note on Arctic dog disease and its relationship to rabies.
Canadian Journal of Comparative Medicine.
11: 330-334.

I want to go on record to congratulate Dave Fowle for what, in my opinion, is a very clear presentation of the situation as it exists in Ontario. I have here with the manuscript which may or may not be used as you wish, maps of Ontario showing the distribution and spread of rabies 1955-- 1954-55 occurrence, 1955-56 occurrence. I have here one of our circulars which went out to our field staff giving the distribution and occurrence of the disease and I notice here in February of this year, in the one month we had these positive diagnoses: 14 fox, 8 dogs, 2 cats, 2 raccoons, 1 wolf, 1 sheep, 1 cow. That was February of the current year. I also have here one of our preliminary reports by Dr. Fythe, our veterinary surgeon, which gives the complete historical and diagnostic account of rabies, the dangers and the way to handle it. The way to look after specimens without destroying them for diagnosis and the dangers of handling and what care should be taken and that sort of thing.

The thing that has given me a good deal of thought, at least food for thought, is why this disease has been in New York state, since 1944. The St. Lawrence River freezes over every year and we do know the gray fox runs back and forth across it, because gray is not very common in Ontario. Occasionally we get some that come over from New York, and yet this disease never came into Ontario through

wild animals from the south, yet it came 600 miles in 20 months from the north. Just as Dr. Fowle says in this paper, there's a tremendous amount about rabies that we don't know. If we're going to do anything about it from the wildlife administrative point of view we have to have a lot more information.

Thank you very much indeed. I hope that this has been of some interest to you people. I don't know what the rabies situation is here, but I thought you might be interested in this invasion of rabies from the north, because it may not stop in Ontario. Thank you.

MR. KIMBALL:

I think we'll postpone any discussion of this subject until we've heard from Dr. E. D. Martin of the Ohio Division of Wildlife. Dr. Martin.

DR. MARTIN (Ohio):

Mr. Chairman. Gentlemen. Rabies is perhaps from the information we can get from literature one of the oldest of diseases.

ASSOCIATION OF MIDWEST FISH & GAME COMMISSIONERS

Importance of Rabies in Wildlife Management

By Dr. E. D. Martin

Rabies is one of the oldest known diseases of animals. In the fourth century, B.C., it was described by Aristotle, who writes: "Dogs suffer from madness which puts them in a state of fury, and all the animals that they bite, when in this condition, become also attacked by rabies". A similar disease, syndrome, was alluded to in the works of Virgil, Horace, Ovid and Plutarch. Cornelius Celsus, who lived in the first century of the Christian era, was the first to allude to human rabies, and to use the word "hydrophobia". Dioscorides recommended excision of the bite wound as a protective remedy; and Galen in the second century gave special remedies for rabies. No references to rabies was found in the literature of the Middle Ages. Bauhin in 1591 mentions the transmission of rabies by

wolves to man. In 1604 an outbreak of rabies in Paris, France was reported by Andry: toward the end of the seventeenth century in Italy by Baglio and co-workers. Outbreaks of the disease occurred in France and Germany in 1719-1723, 1754-1760 in England, and from 1779-1807 in America, West Indies and Peru: and by the beginning of the nineteenth century, rabies had spread over the whole of Europe. Kochlin and Franque reported on an epizootic of rabies in fox in Southern Germany and Switzerland, 1803-1830. H. Thatcher in 1812 reported on an epizootic of rabies in Massachusetts. Apparently as man moved West in this country, rabies accompanied his moves, so now it is common in all states.

Cause of Rabies and Transmission

Experiments indicate that the causative agent (virus) is present in the brain, spinal cord, peripheral nerves, salivary glands, lachrymal glands, aqueous humour of the eye, pancreas, mammae, testicles, kidneys and in their secretions at some time during the course of the disease.

The transmission of rabies from infected animals to non-infected is most often through a break in the skin as the result of a bite and the saliva acts as a vehicle in carrying the virus into the wound. Biting insects can not be eliminated as mechanical carriers.

The incubation period apparently varies with the location of the wound, animal resistance, virulence of the virus and amount that enters the wound. The average length in days is from 12 to 30. There are, however, extremes of from 6 days to one year.

It was impossible to collect data regarding rabies from all the states and Canada, who are members of this organization.

With your permission, I would like to point out to you that the Ohio Department of Natural Resources, and Department of Agriculture have a cooperative understanding with the Department of Health whereby the Department of Health Laboratories examines all specimens from all species of animals suspected of having

rabies. The specimens are collected and sent in to the laboratories by the County Health Commissioners or by practicing Veterinarians cooperating with the County Health Commissioners. Also included in the cooperative understanding are individuals and sportsmens clubs who contribute specimens for examination. The following is a summary of specimens examined by species showing the total number examined, and number positive and suspicious of rabies, from 1945 through the first five months of 1956.

SPECIES	TOTAL NUMBER	POSITIVE	SUSPICIOUS
Dogs	8080	3191	5
Cats	1340	126	1
Cattle	857	326	
Fox	867	547	1
Hogs	104	8	
Sheep	74	25	
Horses	59	9	
Squirrels (Gray and Fox)	246	0	
Rats	162	0	
Mice	9	1	
Goats	10	2	
Cottontail Rabbits	89	0	
Skunks	229	202	
Raccoon	135	1	
Woodchucks	56	0	
Ferrets	3	0	
Opossum	18	0	
Chipmunks	45	0	
Monkeys	3	0	
Weasels	3	0	
Muskrats	17	0	
Mink	5	0	
Groundmoles	6	0	
Deer	1	0	
Guinea Pigs	5	0	
Gophers	4	0	
Wild Ducks	2	0	
Hamsters	15	0	
Coyotes	1	0	
Bats	56	1	

This makes a total of 750 positive cases of rabies in Fox, skunk and raccoon from 1221 specimens examined.

It is interesting to note that a majority of the positive cases in dogs, fox and skunk occurred in the counties bordering on the Ohio River.

To attempt to control rabies in the early part of an outbreak, it would be necessary to enforce strict quarantine regulations on all resident dogs and those coming into the quarantined area. All bordering counties around the one containing the foci of rabies should be included in the quarantine zone. Enforcement should come through education by people who are interested in our economic welfare as well as sportsmen who are interested in wildlife. Certainly one dog warden per county during the early part of an outbreak cannot be expected to handle the dog problem.

In the early part of an outbreak the wildlife administrator should lend every possible effort to reduce the fox population in the quarantine area by den control and trapping. The alternative is to do nothing and let the disease reduce the population and run its course.

I think that is all that I have here, except that I have a chart. This starts back in 1944. In your high column here, of course, is your domesticated positive cases of rabies. Here is your wildlife starting here in '45 with just a little, '46 just a little more and right here it leveled off, and then it jumped way up in '49 and '50, dropped back again in '51, up a little in '52, back again in '53. There's no way that you can get a graph out of it to make sense. Gets up here again in '54 and in--think of this--in '55 it got just a little bit higher than it was in '54, so we don't know whether we're going into an increase in our rabies or whether it's just a greater interest by education of the people that's taken hold of this and we're working a little closer. I don't know which it is at this time.

MR. KIMBALL:

We have a few moments now for discussion of this rabies problem. Do we have any questions?

MR. MORGAN (North Dakota):

We, for the past three years, have been carrying on a cooperative rabies study with the Agricultural College in North Dakota and we haven't found out too much. We have found out that the whole question is a little more complicated than we originally thought it was. Unlike Dr. Harkness and the people in Ontario, we have not been able to convince our people that we do not have a responsibility as custodians of wildlife in an agricultural state, or rather a state that is as highly dependent upon domestic animals as in North Dakota. As a consequence, our efforts have been primarily in self defense, because in recent years particularly rabies has been more or less a problem in the state. We find that our host animal, the important host animal in North Dakota, unlike Dr. Harkness', is the skunk. Therefore we have been carrying on experiments primarily with the skunk. As I say, we have found out some rather interesting things in the behavior patterns even with litter mates given the same dosage will differ widely. The one question that I would like to ask Dr. Harkness is whether or not he has any data that would connect density of populations with the ups of rabies in Ontario? We definitely have established that, I think, with fox populations and ups in rabies in North Dakota.

DR. HARKNESS:

No, unfortunately, Mr. Morgan, we haven't anything of that nature at all, because this thing came in from the north, you see, very rapidly on us and it doesn't seem to be associated with any major fluctuation in population in the north; that is, beyond Ontario in the northwest territories. When it got down into Ontario, it did come in at a time when the fox population was very high. Certainly in Ontario, there has been such a reduction of fox population that they could hardly find any foxes up there any more and our assumption is that the rabies have been responsible for that reduction in foxes. The high population of foxes, as far as we know, is nothing more than an ordinary peak of a cycle, but

it certainly hit northern Ontario at the peak of a fox cycle. That's down now, and it came into southern Ontario at the peak or just following the peak of a fox cycle certainly when the southern Ontario was swarming with foxes and we don't know whether they're falling off in southern Ontario now or not. We rather suspect that they are, but it hasn't been there long enough for us--we just don't know. But certainly they've disappeared in northern Ontario.

Now a couple of points I should have mentioned: that just as soon as they hit northern Ontario, we went in there with the help of animal people, the veterinarians, our officers, and their officers to put on a tremendous campaign, and we innoculated every sleigh dog all through that Patricia area. I mean the Indians had hundreds of dogs and every one of them, as far as we know, was innoculated. That came right down along with the epidemic into southern Ontario until we got into centers of high population in Sudbury, North Bay and finally Toronto. After that we said, "Well it's up to the dog owners from here out. We're not going to pay. The public health isn't going to pay for the shots any more." In Toronto we did a great deal of publicity among the hunters advising them as to the danger of taking hunting dogs up to northern Ontario, (because we hunt deer with dogs, incidentally, in Ontario) where the rabies were present and bring it back into the city. We didn't make any census, therefore I have no report of any hunters who actually took their dogs up that didn't get them innoculated, before they took them up. I've been talking to some of the vets around Toronto and they think that we have somewhere about 40 and 60 percent of the Toronto dogs innoculated on a voluntary basis at fees anywhere between $4 to $6 a shot, depending on which vet they took them to. Thank you.

I have a few copies of this paper here. I don't know whether it's particularly pertinent or not, because it may come in the transactions anyway. If any person wants a copy of this paper, just give me your name and I'll send you some through the mail.

MR. MORGAN (North Dakota):

Just one more comment for those of you who may have a rabies problem. I think we've pretty definitely demonstrated in North Dakota that it's a good job to have a look at these suspects yourself. We were depending entirely upon health officials to determine whether or not these specimens were rabies specimens. I think they were using the intrusion body method entirely which can be developed through other diseases, and for your own protection it's just as well to have a technician that is working with them.

MR. FOOTLOCK (Michigan):

I have a couple of observations to make. This is in connection with the mysterious angle of rabies. Michigan has a big population of foxes and as yet we have no authenticated case of rabies in foxes. Now we've been looking with a fishy eye at Ohio for a long time. I guess now we'll have to turn it toward Ontario. Now, we've had rabies in dogs and in other domestic animals--cattle, sheep, etc. Diagnoses of rabies made in skunks and raccoons, but still not a single authenticated case in foxes. Mr. Morgan took the words right out of my mouth about the question of diagnosis. You ought to be concerned about the diagnosis of rabies in skunks or raccoons or some of those other animals, because we've had an experience lately where a diagnosis was made of rabies in a skunk, and it turned out later, to the best of our knowledge, not to be that. That particular point was made some time ago by people in Connecticut who made a study of a number of cases of positive diagnoses of rabies on the basis of a Negri body, the smear test, and it turned out later that they could not substantiate the diagnoses by the much more precise mouse test.

MR. KIMBALL:

Any further discussion? If not, we'll proceed.

You know, the name of this next gentleman on the program has a familiar ring

to me. In fact, he confused the people of Colorado the time that he came out to the meeting of the Midwest last year, and still being confused on the matter of long distance telephone calls. One came in for me and it turned out to be his, and one came in for him and turned out to be mine. So I guess we're just going to have to flip a coin to see which one of us changes our name. That was his suggestion. I'd like to present Mr. James Kimball, one of the better Kimballs, from the Minnesota Department, who will talk to us on "Are General Plans for Federal Lands Meeting Expectations?" and he will be followed by Dan Janzen of the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

MR. JAMES KIMBALL (Minnesota):

Thank you, Cousin Tom.

Before the enactment of Public Law 732 neither the states nor the Fish and Wildlife Service had much authority in their vain efforts to do something in the way of saving fish and wildlife values in connection with the Army and the Bureau of Reclamation projects. However, these early endeavors did show that there was a lot of land being controlled by the Army that could well be used for the production of wildlife. This led to the amendment of the Coordination Act which we now know as Public Law 732. I know that some of the men in this room had a great deal to do with that amendment with this Public Law 732, which we know to be so important now.

Very briefly stated, the objectives of Public Law 732 are two in number. The first would be to facilitate investigations of Corps and Bureau projects and to make recommendations which will lead to the mitigation of losses and to possible enhancement of wildlife values. The second would be to provide for management of fish and wildlife resources on these areas. The general plan, and I'm speaking of the general plan as it's used in the title of this program, is frequently a three-way agreement between the Corps of Engineers, the states, and the Fish and Wildlife Service. That is, it is a three-way agreement, when the fish and wildlife

concerned is migratory wildlife. Otherwise, the general plan can be a two-way agreement between the Corps and the states.

We have learned that the general plans seldom present a serious problem, but the general plan has little value without a good cooperative agreement. Obtaining the cooperative agreement, which are mutually satisfactory to the states, to the Service, and to the Corps are sometimes a good deal more difficult. In the past the Corps has sometimes wanted to transfer some of these lands under the Flood Control Act rather than under Public Law 732, which is of greater advantage to the states. A controversey not settled at the moment is whether or not the states can use the proceeds from crops harvested from these lands to help defray wildlife costs and wildlife management costs. Well, my part on this program is not to throw much light on this very complicated problem, but rather to locate the talents of someone who can. When Hayden Olds got in touch with me to get on this program, I didn't promise to enlighten you very much, I promised to find someone who could. I think I have done that, because I got Dan Janzen to agree to pursue this problem, so I think my second obligation to you now is to sit down so that Dan can take over and tell you the story.

MR. JANZEN (Fish and Wildlife Service):

Well, Jim, you have made just about unnecessary the first three pages of my talk here and I am just wondering where to start. This title doesn't have a great deal of sex appeal, but I would judge from the subject title, "Are General Plans for Federal Lands Meeting Expectations?" that somebody has some doubts.

ARE GENERAL PLANS FOR FEDERAL LANDS MEETING EXPECTATIONS?

D. H. Janzen, Regional Director
U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service

I would judge from the subject title assigned me, "Are General Plans for Federal Lands Meeting Expectations?" that somebody has some doubts. This doesn't surprise me because I have had some doubts myself during the past ten year

struggle with General Plans, Cooperative Agreements, licenses, and so forth -- but before discussing some of our trials and tribulations, I would like to give you a little background on how this all came about.

Ten years ago, Congress amended the old so-called Wildlife Coordination Act. This amendment is generally known as Public Law 732.

It was designed primarily to do two things: 1 - prevent or mitigate losses and damage to wildlife resources resulting from Federal projects involving flood control, navigation, reclamation, power and so on; and 2 - it was to provide for wildlife management of the substantial acreage of lands and waters acquired on these projects where such management did not interfere with the primary purpose of the project. It is this number two objective that we are concerned with today.

The Act says (and I have omitted some of the "whereases" and "wherefores") "Whenever the waters of any stream or other body of water are impounded, diverted or otherwise controlled for any purpose whatever by any department or agency of the United States, adequate provision consistent with the primary purpose of such impoundment, diversion, or other control shall be made for the use thereof, together with any area of land ..... for the conservation, maintenance, and management of wildlife and its habitat ....." This gives the objective. The next clause tells us how this is to be done. "In accordance with General Plans" (and this is where the much used or abused word, GENERAL PLANS comes from) ..... "approved jointly by the head of the department or agency exercising primary administration thereof, the Secretary of the Interior, and the head of the agency exercising administration over the wildlife resources of the State wherein the waters and areas lie, such waters and other interests shall be made available without cost of administration (a) by such State agency, if the management thereof for the conservation of wildlife relates to other than migratory birds; (b) by the Secretary of the Interior if the waters and other interests have particular value in carrying out the National Migratory Bird Management Program."

Another section gives the Secretary of the Interior authority to enter into further agreements with the States whereby the State may manage a whole or part of the lands determined to be of particular value in carrying out the National Migratory Bird Management Program.

Now, to get back to the subject, "Are General Plans for Federal Lands Meeting Expectations?" there has been a great deal of confusion and misunderstanding not only between the States and the Service but within the Service itself on the use of the term, "General Plans."

Reduced to its simplest terms, the General Plan is an agreement between the Federal constructing agency, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the State Conservation Department describing lands which will be made available for wildlife management purposes and whether for migratory birds, for wildlife other than migratory birds, or a combination of both.

The General Plans actually do not present much of a problem since the Service has been designating very few key areas as of particular value to the National Migratory Waterfowl Program. In most cases the State, the Service and the constructing agency have not had too much trouble determining what areas were of particular value to waterfowl. Our troubles begin when we start working out the details of a Cooperative Agreement, which is the document that actually makes the lands legally available for wildlife purposes and includes the operating details. (If it were not for details, life could be wonderfully simple.) It is, therefore, impossible to talk about General Plans without including Cooperative Agreements. In fact, it is now current practice to negotiate General Plans and Cooperative Agreements simultaneously.

To date, ten General Plans and Cooperative Agreements have been executed in Region 3 and three more plans are pending. How satisfactory existing completed plans will work out only history can tell, but I can assure you that many man-hours of hard work on the part of many people were necessary before the final signatures

were secured.

As I mentioned before, the States and the Service generally have been able to get together on whether an area was of particular value in the waterfowl program. Not all such areas are managed as National Migratory Waterfowl Refuges. In many cases, while they are of importance in the National picture, they either are not needed as a National refuge or do not lend themselves to such management and Cooperative Agreements are then entered into between the State and the Service for their management by the State as public hunting grounds.

Originally one of our first hurdles toward a satisfactory plan of operation lay in the short-term licenses the Corps of Engineers wished to grant the Service and the States at the inception of this program. At that time, the Corps was thinking in terms of five-year licenses. This was finally raised to 20 and 25 years, but even this was not always satisfactory when a heavy State investment for capital improvements was being considered. We finally hit upon the use of Cooperative Agreements which were of indefinite tenure and could be terminated only by mutual agreement or for reasons which were clearly outlined in the agreement. Thus, capital investments are safeguarded on an indefinite term basis and the Attorney Generals from several States have indicated that their respective State Conservation Departments can safely make capital expenditures with such an instrument.

One of our biggest problems resulted from different Districts and Divisions of the Corps each having their own ideas on how to carry out the program outlined in Public Law 732. After a great deal of negotiations, both in the field and in Washington, two agreements between the Service and the Corps have resulted in a hope that more uniform procedures will now be followed in the field. The latest of these agreements was the one covering "Procedures for Developing General Plans for Fish and Wildlife Management" signed by Director Farley for the Service and General Sturgis for the Corps early in 1955. Copies of these instruments were

furnished each of the States. These agreements do not go into details, with the result there is still much room for argument, but the principle of Public Law 732 is recognized in this document and it is agreed that authority as granted in this Act will be used in planning the management of fish and wildlife. This gives us a general basis for negotiating with the field force of the Corps.

Another problem still unresolved is whether the proceeds from the sale of crops may be expended in the development of wildlife by the agency administering the land. This question stems from the Flood Control Act of 1954 (Public Law 780). The pertinent part of this law is quoted as follows: "That in any such license to a Federal, State or local Governmental agency which involves lands to be utilized for the development and conservation of fish and wildlife, forests, or other natural resources, the licensee or lessee may be authorized to cut timber and harvest crops as may be necessary to further such beneficial uses and to collect and utilize the proceeds of any sale of timber and crops in the development, conservation, maintenance, and utilization of such lands."

The Corps maintains that "crops" in this Act means perennial crops such as wild hay, timber, and so forth, and not annual crops such as grains. In other words, if the Corps' opinion prevails, proceeds from annual agriculture crops could not be utilized on the project to further wildlife management practices by the managing agency. The Service at the present time has requested an Attorney General's opinion.

Another unreconciled problem which is very serious and should be of utmost concern to the States lies in the reconveyance legislation which Congress recently passed covering several projects outside of the middlewest. This legislation, in short, gives the Corps authority to sell back to the original owners lands not needed for the primary purpose of the project and provided that the lands are not needed for public purposes. Unfortunately, to date the Corps has not declared lands important to wildlife as needed for public purposes -- even where a General

Plan has been agreed upon and executed setting forth their value for wildlife management purposes. Thus it is easy to see where this reconveyance legislation could easily ruin many of our well laid plans for managing wildlife on reservoirs and other types of Federal projects. We know of one area where the State is already managing a sizeable unit which is now subject to reconveyance, and in spite of the fact that its management for wildlife has already been conveyed to the State.

It is our contention that since the reservoirs of the Corps of Engineers are constructed in the public interest and at public expense, any and all benefits to the general public should have paramount consideration.

Basically, it appears that the problem arises from the Corps' apparent opinion that wildlife management is not an authorized project purpose in connection with reservoir development in spite of the provisions of Public Law 732 which are very broad and all inclusive insofar as Federal water manipulation projects are concerned. This is a very serious problem in which every State represented in this room will be interested. Certainly every state which now is managing any Federally purchased lands on a navigation or flood control project will wish to look into the soundness of its investment.

One other problem which has been fairly well resolved has to do with public hunting on agricultural lands not desired by either the Service or State for special wildlife management. It has been the contention of both the States and our Service that since such lands were purchased with public funds, they should be leased to third parties in such a manner that the general public would be permitted the access necessary to permit public hunting and fishing. An agreement between the Service and the Corps, of which copies have been furnished all the States, was reached about two years ago and the only question remaining is for us to come to an agreement with the various Corps' field offices on the mechanics of handling the problem on the different units.

The last point I want to make is that where the General Plan determines that a given project has wildlife values primarily other than migratory birds and the transfer of management is, therefore, made direct from the Corps to the State, it is the responsibility of the State to see that the transfer document is adequate. The Service will be glad to cooperate but it is not particularly concerned unless the State plans to finance the project under the Federal Aid program, in which case the Service, of course, has to satisfy itself that the investment is adequately safeguarded.

The points I have covered include most of the important ones which come to my mind. In summarizing the question, "Are General Plans for Federal Lands Meeting Expectations?" I can only say that undoubtedly we would have better results under more specific detailed legislation, but, until we get such, we will try to do the best we can with what we have.

If there are any questions, I will be glad to try and answer them.

MR. KIMBALL (Colorado):

We will now open the meeting for discussion. Hayden?

MR. OLDS (Ohio):

I'd like to ask Mr. Janzen, if under this reconveyance law, whether there is an opportunity to buy the land back by the original landowner, and if it is sold back, will it be a deal between the Corps of Engineers and the former landowner, or will the General Service Administration be involved in it?

MR. JANZEN:

As I understand it, the Corps will handle it. I believe there was an order, at least I noticed an order in the federal register giving that authority to the Chief of the Corps of Engineers. Does anyone have any other information? As far as I understand now, the Corps will handle that.

MR. BARNES (Indiana):

I believe that the new Mansfield Reservoir in Indiana has been proposed by the Army Engineers as a reconveyance project. If so, we are very much interested in that. If this land is to be reconveyed to the original landowner, it will really pose quite a problem with us. Now, what steps do we take to try to acquire that for public ownership?

MR. JANZEN:

It appears to me that specific legislation is going to be necessary declaring fish and wildlife management by the states as a public purpose, because under the present Flood Control perpetration of the Corps they don't consider it as such.

MR. BARNES:

Well, what about public acquisition for recreation, that is, for park purposes or other purposes? Is that possible?

MR. JANZEN:

Well, I might mention that at the present time there has been a bill introduced in Congress, I believe that does provide that recreation and park purposes could be declared as a public purpose. It hasn't been passed. If that were amended to include fish and wildlife management, it would probably take care of our problem. If there's anybody who's been closer to this legislation in Washington, I'd be glad to have him speak up because we're quite a distance from that and we get copies of the bills that are occasionally introduced, but I don't know how far that particular bill has gone. It's all-important and certainly fish and wildlife management, I believe, should be classified with parks and recreation as a public purpose, if such a bill is passed.

MR. KIMBALL:

The International Association has long supported an amendment to Public Law

732. I understand that there's some difference of opinion between the Fish and Wildlife Service and some of the states as to just whether or not those proposed amendments do strengthen enough Public Law 732. This proposed bill, which has been introduced by Senator McClellan of Arkansas, who is conceded to be the spokesman also for the Corps of Engineers, he has backed off from supporting that bill, I think, because of opposition on the part of some of the states in the lower Mississippi Valley to strengthening that Coordination Act. It means, to me at least, that wildlife, fish and game interests are going to proceed and to have recognition on these projects more than it has in the past. We're going to have to get busy and do more than just pass resolutions, we are going to have to see that Congress is informed of the public's wishes in this respect and get something enacted. We've had this bill up now for this session of Congress, and if I recall correctly, it's been up in a session before. We're meeting with the opposition of a pretty powerful group there in Washington, and we're going to have to get on the ball to overcome it.

MR. MORGAN (North Dakota):

Right along that line, as I recall it, that bill has been in committee and is very apt to die in committee unless an organization such as this can force it out. I'm wondering if there's anything that this organization can do to get the powers that be to bring that thing up for a hearing in the immediate future.

MR. KIMBALL:

Well, the voice of the people, Bud, is the only thing that's going to do it. And we're going to have to stir that up.

MR. MORGAN:

Then it would be my recommendation that the members of this organization, as soon as they get home, contact their Congressional delegation asking, urging in fact, very strenuously, that that thing be brought up.

MR. KIMBALL:

Any further discussion?

Before I turn the meeting back to our president, I'd like to relate some later information from Washington. I just received a long distance telephone call - I found out that House Bill 11570, which is the reorganization bill for the Fish and Wildlife Service has just passed the House. A different bill, Senate Bill 3275, which passed the Senate unanimously and also is concerned with the reorganization of the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service has passed the Senate before the House Bill passed and both bills are going to a conference committee. Now, as most of you already know, the Senate bill, introduced by Senator Magnuson of Washington, state of Washington, called for a distinct division of the fisheries, both commercial and sport fisheries, and the wildlife within the Fish and Wildlife Service. That was objected to, I think, by the Department of Interior and as a result an executive order came out of the White House, to be effective the first of July, to be practically the same thing by administrative action. Of course, that met with considerable opposition by most of the state fish and game departments. We so informed our members in Congress and just recently, within the last two weeks, a number of us went to Washington to talk with the people there on these two bills and on the executive order. As a result, this House Bill, which I think, was enacted today, contained a compromise which we felt was acceptable to the sport fisheries group and to the state people as well as to the commercial fish industry. Just what will happen to it in the conference committee I think will depend a lot on, again, the voice of the people, or the states in voicing their opposition to changing the House measure. Now I was very disturbed to hear that, in connection with this House Bill, there are two sections, and I'd like to have Ernie Swift pay particular attention to this, see if he knows anything about it, that Section 5A in the House Bill and Section 31 in the Senate Bill transferred the wildlife activities of the Forest Service to the Department of Interior. Do

you know anything about that, Ernie?

MR. SWIFT:

No, I don't.

MR. KIMBALL:

Well, that's the latest word that I have from Washington, Ernie. The Bill as passed contained that provision, and if it does, I think we better take some quick action, because it's probably in conference committee right now to be decided between the Senate and the House.

MR. SWIFT:

Well, Friday when I left, Charlie Callison told me it was going to come up today in the House. When it comes to compromise in the committee you've got to keep the pressure on, so that some of the bad features of the Magnuson Bill aren't transposed over into the compromise. Now, one of the things that the commercial fisheries are fighting the hardest for is to get control of the fur seal. They want that all swung over into the commercial fisheries. And I believe that, as the bill read, it was to go to the wildlife section of this new bureau. If you just sit back now and feel that this compromise will come out all right, I wouldn't say that it was unless you keep the pressure on.

MR. KIMBALL:

Of course, I'm particularly concerned about this transfer of wildlife activities of the Forest to the Department of Interior. Did you know that was in the bill?

MR. SWIFT:

No, I couldn't answer that. There was an old understanding as far as research years ago, where that was transferred over to the Department of Interior, but that was strictly certain types of research.

MR. KIMBALL:

Well, I wonder if you could phone Charlie tonight and get the lowdown on this, and let us know first thing in the morning.

MR. SWIFT:

I'll do that, so that we can talk a little bit more intelligently.

MR. KIMBALL:

The two members of the conference committee is the chairman of the Senate Committee which is Senator Magnuson from Washington, and the member of the House is Representative Bonner. I think he's from North Carolina. Those two will be members of the committee. The other members I don't think have been appointed as yet, or that information is not available, but those two will be the principal members of the conference committee.

Any further questions on that?

Just for a point of information, the fur seal industry is in commercial fisheries now. I don't know what is meant by any possible change, but it has been there for a great many years, so that wouldn't be a departure.

MR. KIMBALL:

Well, I think the principal objection is that there is revenue attached to the fur seal. Isn't it a couple of million dollars annually? Since the bill does provide for quite a bit of financial assistance to the commercial fishing industry, we felt that that revenue from fur seals should go to the wildlife and sport fisheries. This would give them a little support, if they're going to split those divisions. Is that correct, Ernie?

MR. KIMBALL:

Well, the state's share would be over a million dollars. That's still quite a bit of revenue to be devoted to sport fishery and wildlife work within the Service.

Time has gone by and without any further ado, therefore I'll turn the meeting back to our president, Mr. Palmer.

MR. PALMER:

In conclusion, I want to remind you of the resolutions committee meeting in the Anniversary Room right after this meeting adjourns. They're to meet right at the conclusion of this meeting. The smoker, as I mentioned, has been advanced from 7 o'clock to 6 o'clock. It'll be held in the Green Room. I believe that concludes our afternoon meeting.

FIRST SESSION, A.M., JULY 10

MR. PALMER:

This afternoon, as your program states, we want to show you our new conservation area out at the edge of town at the State Fairground. We'll have conservation cars waiting for you here at the hotel for anyone who wishes transportation and do not have their own. We urge all of you to see it, if you can, because we feel we've got something well worth your time.

This morning, it is indeed a pleasure to introduce your discussion leader, Mr. Ruhl, because I think anyone in a meeting of this character is always glad to pass the buck to someone else. Mr. Ruhl.

MR. RUHL (Michigan):

President Palmer and friends. Of course any good administrator can get rid of it quickly, which I propose to do. Time is one factor, we have a number of subjects to discuss, a number of people to present ideas, and we want to leave time for discussion. This bevy of younger talent is younger even though Fran Gillett has a lot of gray hair, or white, whichever you'd call it, introduce two things to some of us old timers of which I count myself as one, not the oldest, of course, not a charter, but older. See some of the younger folks come along and participate in the discussions at the International. I want to assure them

that they should say what they think and that they can be frank and direct to this group and expect it to be the same way if someone disagrees with them. That's one of the purposes of the organization--it's small enough so you can do that.

The first topic is the "Establishment and Management of Captive Goose Flocks and the Attendant Problems". This is a case where the attendant problems will cover quite a lot of ground, sneaks up on the real problem: administration. I think we're fortunate to have some of the boys who are working more closely with those problems to discuss them than some of us.

The first discussion is by Fran Gillett of the Fish and Wildlife Service, who is in charge of the refuges of this region, has had long association with waterfowl problems and the management of goose flocks. Fran.

MR. GILLETT (U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Minneapolis):

Thank you, Harry.

The management of captive goose flocks for propagating purposes is the one facet of the management of Canada geese. To lead out, I will review some of our experiences in handling captive goose flocks on the national wildlife refuges, and some of the attendant problems. We won't get too deeply into the attendant problems, because I assume that much of that will come from the floor.

There are presently 17 of 31 major refuges, national wildlife refuges, in Region 3 that have nesting Canada geese or have captive flocks of Canada geese for breeding purposes. Nesting has been established to a greater or lesser degree on 10 refuges. Production ranges from a few broods to as many as 1,000 young per year. Ten refuges are holding captive flocks totaling 875 geese, with individual flocks ranging from 36 to 138 in number. These captive flocks are held in pens varying in size from 7 to 200 acres. While it is still too early to evaluate production this year, it appears that Seney will have its most successful year with about 1,000 goslings. Lower Souris estimates production at about 200. The captive flocks have not done as well as was expected. We are in the process of

analyzing our operations to determine where our difficulties lie. We are convinced that crippled birds picked up during the hunting season or wild caught birds as they come from the trap, do not make good breeding stock. The reason for this is not definitely known, although the theory has been advanced that adult females that have nested elsewhere will not readily nest in new locations. Not only do these birds not nest but they become quarrelsome during the nesting season and disrupt nesting attempts by others. We are planning to conduct experiments in the selection of breeding flocks using even aged birds from various sources. Since our present goose flocks are mixed birds, most of which are pinioned, we are experimenting to determine if there are any ways in which we can encourage birds in such a flock to nest. In the beginning of the goose propagation program, we had geese escape from enclosures and often these birds nested in the marsh. The presence of the Seney flock was established after the penned birds escaped. The Lower Souris flock was turned out into the marsh and immediately started nesting. We have, therefore, released portions of our captive flocks on several refuges with the intention of capturing the pinioned birds in the fall. There is some indication that at least some of these releases will be successful. Parent birds have been observed and some nests have been located, but it is still too early to evaluate this experiment. In two instances released birds started overland migrations on foot, which is rather disconcerting. The establishment of nesting geese from captive flocks is often a very slow process and several years may be required to get results. While we are conducting experiments with the flocks, we are also trying to improve our goose pens. We have learned that there are some essential features that should be included in any pen designed for nesting geese. Habitat for year-round use is most desirable. Where possible, the pen should be large enough to contain agricultural land for production of grain and browse crops, as well as marsh and water. Geese prefer to nest on islands and some islands are desirable, if not essential. We are in the process of construct-

ing islands in pens, where islands are lacking. If possible, birds should be held in the pens all year, but if the lack of protection from winter storms or predators require that they be moved to a more protected site during the winter, they should be placed in a pen at the earliest possible time in the spring with the least possible amount of disturbance. Predator control is essential and is especially important, if nesting islands are not inaccessible. Raccoon, skunk, coyote, and fox are the most common predators during the nesting season, and must be kept at a minimum. Pens with fine mesh lower wires, and charged wires strung just above the grass level will keep out most predators. Once nesting is established and free-flyers select nesting sites at will, predator control must be aimed at holding down the predator population in the entire area. Before closing, I must mention the possible conflict with the migratory waterfowl regulations. Goose pens located near refuge boundaries may cause captive geese to act as decoys to hunters outside the refuge. Similarly, feed place for captive geese may attract wild geese, and if located near the refuge boundary may place a hunter in violation of the baiting law. Rather than place a hunter in jeopardy, we make it a point to check with our game management agents wherever there is any question as to possible violation of migratory waterfowl regulations, before setting up a goose management project.

MR. RUHL:

I think if you have some specific questions on the subject that has just been discussed, now would be a good time to do that. On the other hand, if we're going to get into those attendant problems, perhaps we should wait until the further discussion presentation. Are there any questions on this specific phase of rearing the geese and handling them? You're all going to accept that as gospel?

Well, if there are no discussions or questions at this time, I understand that Ted has decided that he can handle all the rest of the material, therefore Ted Shanks, of Missouri, is going to lead the discussion. I think George has agreed

to answer all the questions.

MR. SHANKS (Missouri):

Before we get into the other phase of this, I would like to mention one thing that we have had experience with concerning production units of captive flocks at Fountain Grove. At Fountain Grove in Missouri we have noticed that, if we turn domestic females loose, quite frequently they will attract an old wild male bird, and the female will then go ahead and produce young. This, of course, gives you an opportunity of having, shall we say, half-wild birds in your flock and possibly will prove to work better than just using both males and females.

Actually, there are two major reasons for the Fish and Wildlife Service or our conservation agency for establishing captive goose flocks. Mr. Gillett has covered the use of captive flocks for productive purposes. The second thing that the captive flock is used for is as a call flock or a decoy flock, whatever you wish to call them, to attract birds to an area with the express intention of building up a concentration of wild, migrant birds. However, here's where we get into the attendant problems. Your call flock will just serve as an attractor and your area has to be properly handled from habitat standpoint, if you plan to hold the birds for any length of time. Otherwise, your call flock will call them in and they'll stay overnight and go on the next day.

The requirements for suitably managed Canada goose area, I think, can be summed up in three words: food, refuge, and water. I think that is also the order of their importance. Obviously, you have to have refuge; you also have to have food. One without the other will not work. Water is of relatively minor importance. It is only placed in there, because you do have to have some water available. I'd like to give an example. It's one of the few examples that I know of where a call flock has really worked in pulling birds into an area in which there had never been any goose usage previously. There is a farmer who lives about 10 miles south of Columbia, Missouri. He has a farm, as I recall, of about 360 acres.

He put 27 Canada geese in a pen and he didn't allow any hunting, finally he set it up as a cooperative refuge with the Missouri Conservation Commission. That arrangement lasted until 1947, at which time he wanted to do away with the refuge. His main reason was he was wintering 12,000 Canada geese on his 360 acre farm. He had a total of 5 acres of water. There were so many birds actually that they couldn't all get on the water at the same time. I mention that as an example of the fact that Canada geese don't need a lot of water. If you've got a refuge, if you've got food, they'll stay there. Now, when you get into food, I think then you have to consider differences of latitude, climatic conditions, soil conditions, and so on. What is good goose management in, say, southern Illinois, may not be good goose management in North Missouri. What is good goose management in north Missouri may not be good goose management in Iowa. Now, I'm speaking from the food production standpoint. In Iowa, they have an area which I had the good fortune to look at, called Big Marsh, and they are attempting to establish a flock of Canada geese using a captive flock as a call flock. In flying over that area, it is, from a Canada goose standpoint, one thing is very noticeable lacking from that area is a browse crop. That, of course, is corn country; I guess they do raise some beans in there, but there's no wheat. Now, a Canada goose has to have some sort of browse. At the Swan Lake refuge in north Missouri, there has been only one year that there were virtually no birds there. That particular year there was a complete crop failure of wheat. I think in such an area as the Iowa area, you would have to go strong on your managed area to wheat. Now George, for example, in southern Illinois utilizes legumes much more than we can further north, because of our more extreme winters and freezing weather, and so on.

I think that's about all I had to say.

MR. RUHL:

It sounds simple, doesn't it?

George, do you have any remarks you want to make now?

important part of this management. I think we should remind ourselves that we have somewhere between five and six hundred thousand Canada geese on this continent. At least that is the estimate, and probably we can harvest a hundred to a hundred and twenty-five thousand birds a year. In passing, I'd like to comment further on that point and express the opinion that our present bag limit, I think, is larger than it ought to be. We can't, I think, logically allow two Canada geese per hunter per day, when we have only 125,000 birds on this whole continent to harvest. We have two and a quarter million waterfowl hunters and the only reason the great majority of them don't get to shoot any Canada geese is because there aren't enough Canada geese to go around. May I remind you that we have in this country something like 13 to 14 million deer. We normally harvest one deer per person per year in the average state. I think we could do well to get along with one goose a day for the 60 or 70 days that we do harvest that particular species. Getting back to what I was talking about, which is the management of the species, I have heard, and I sense a movement in your organization to do away with the growing of high quality crops and their manipulation for the benefit of geese for the purpose, as I understand it, of dispersing the birds over a greater range. I think it's fine to disperse them; I think they ought to be dispersed, but not by pushing them out into unprotected areas where they have to exist on low quality feedstuffs. I think it's pretty well demonstrated in wildlife management that the quality of nutrition is essential to and in fact critical in reproduction and in the survival and growth of young; in the size of the crop that you can produce from any breeding stock. Qualitative nutrition is important, in my humble opinion, in the management of waterfowl in these United States. Now, with respect to whether we're going to manage these birds on managed areas where we can supply them with qualitative foodstuffs, or whether we're going to push them out to range on saw grass and other stuff down along the gulf coast, I want to point out this: that when we boil wildlife management in

these United States down to the final analysis, shear it of all its trimmings, and really analyze our problems, we've got ourselves an economic problem, pure and simple. It's just a question of whether we or somebody else is going to use this land for what purpose. I think we should all understand that sooner or later we're going to have to put more money and more effort into the acquisition in management of lands for the purposes that we want or we're going to be left out in the cold. That's the trend. A lot of things have happened in the last 50 years in these United States in this particular thing that I'm talking about; the use of the land. But it's nothing compared to what's going to happen in the next 50 years. I think we're going to have to build us some hotels for waterfowl and particularly for Canada geese up and down our flyways, if we want to maintain this resource and enjoy this type of recreation. I think we can do that, if we're willing to do it, but not without setting up hotels and not without setting up good ones, the kind that will really do the job. That means we've got to have some water and a lot more land for upland grazing, because the bird is a grazing bird. It means that we've got to supply that bird with qualitative foodstuffs so that it can be well nourished during the period that it is in our part of the flyway, and go back to its adequate breeding grounds to do a good job of producing a crop that will come back another year for our hunters to harvest. Thank you.

MR. RUHL:

If you boys have any comments, the meeting is yours.

MR. SHANKS:

I would just like to say one thing. In essence I agree with what Mr. Steen has said. However, he mentioned the word dispersal. We can't get away from the fact that the Canada goose is by nature a gregarious bird. They flock together and dispersal has been tried, very unsuccessfully. We get to this business of concentrations, of whether you are concentrating birds from other areas into a

refuge. Personally, I don't think that you're doing that. I think that your increase in numbers of birds on a refuge like Swan Lake, for example, is a very real increase. It's accomplished by the very simple fact that your refuge has protected those birds in the fall and sent more birds back in the spring, and you get more back the following fall. It's just pure mathematics. Now, this particular chart shows the fall and wintering flock of Canada geese at Swan Lake. Incidentally, while we've got this chart up here, I'd like to point out one thing that's quite interesting. This red line represents the acres in crop production. Now, you'll notice that over the years, it starts in 1941, and over the years the acreage of crop production at Swan Lake has been steadily increasing. This line here shows the peak fall concentration and I would call your attention to the fact of how closely they parallel each other. Then, this is the wintering population. If you'll notice, there's quite a variation between your actual wintering population and your peak fall population. You can't argue that you're concentrating those birds. Neither can a southern state argue that you're stealing birds from them. Obviously, you're not. Those birds are going on south. That's the only point I wanted to make.

MR. RUHL:

Did I understand, you can have your cake and eat it too?

MR. SHANKS:

That's right.

MR. JANZEN:

I kind of hate to leave Hayden Olds sitting there with that frustrated look. I'm left with that frustrated feeling, Hayden, every time this baiting question arises and the live decoy question comes up on this goose problem. I'm sitting there where decisions have to be made every fall and they're not easy to make. No one, yet, has written a baiting regulation that is easy to enforce. We've

hopped around with it and we've talked about distances; we've gotten back now to just about what we had before and I see no other way to handle it as we have to date. I want to bring in this question that Mel raised about not knocking down corn to disperse the birds. That was not the reason why we decided not to knock down corn. The reason was that knocking down the corn is prohibited by the individual, if it's for the purpose, not for the purpose, but if it attracts birds in to the hunter. We haven't yet found out a way to set up a double standard for publicly owned lands and privately owned lands. We're experimenting with the planting of grains and wheat, not wheat but corn, and other foods that will be made available to the birds without knocking them down. Something that will be legal under the baiting regulations that anybody can grow. Now, let's not kid ourselves that there are all ways and means of legally baiting, because even when you grow corn specifically for birds, you're baiting; it's there for the purpose of drawing. For the purpose of the legal language of the baiting regulation, we cannot now manipulate corn. I mean a private individual may not do so, without placing a hunter in jeopardy. We decided we can't afford to do it on our federal refuges so we have asked our agents, in each case, to determine what we can do. Sometimes that can't be determined, either, until the hunting season starts, but we have followed certain rules of the thumb. For example, we try never to have a live decoy flock closer than a half a mile of our shooting line. The area has to be big enough so the birds can move around. We can't give you any more information than we've given you in the past. Most of the other states are in the same boat.

MR. RUHL:

Well, I take it though, that it's a matter of judgement; that it is possible to arrive at an agreement in 1956 on a specific area anyhow.

MR. STEIN:

I should like to correct any impression that Dan apparently got from my dis-

cussion to the effect that I referred to such a thing as knocking down corn and objected to it, because of its effect on dispersal of a flock. That was not what I had in mind, Dan. I stated that I believe in dispersing the birds. I'm not going to get into the question of baiting, because that's an involved and sometimes an embarrassing one. I'm talking here about the management of this resource. I said I believe in dispersing the flocks. I do, but not by discontinuing the production of high quality cultivated foodstuffs on these management areas, as many of your people are advocating. I know they're advocating this, because they've told me so themselves. Now then, I believe in dispersing these flocks by creating more Swan Lakes, Horseshoe Lakes, Crab Orchards, and what not. I think we can do it. I think we can have a million and a half Canada geese on this continent, instead of half a million. I think the species is susceptible to management, but it is not susceptible to management by dispersing it, forcing it out onto second-rate and third-rate range. That's what I had in mind.

MR. JANZEN:

I misunderstood you, Mel. I know what you're talking about there. There are two distinct schools of thought on this, all right. We have one of our own organization that feels very definitely that we should raise the quality of goose hunting. They feel it can't be done as long as we produce food which will result not only in concentrating, or not only having more birds, but making them tamer and so forth, and they feel that we should make them wild again. I think they are overlooking the civilization which will not permit them to be wild and hunt them the old way where we had a limited space in which to hunt them. This is my personal feeling on the matter, but we do have those two schools of thought in our own organization.

MR. KIMBALL (Colorado):

Dan, what percent of the feed actually eaten by these geese can be produced

on the refuge area? They've got to disperse to feed. You can't feed them on the area. It's impossible.

MR. JANZEN:

Well, during the hunting season, I believe here in the Mississippi flyway they're getting most of their food from the refuges. They just are not permitted to land anywhere. Goose hunters will go to any extremes to get at a flock of geese and in the prairie section it's getting that way. Take in North Dakota for example, you have a flock of geese off of a refuge and you have a whole flock of automobiles converging on those geese, studying where they're feeding that evening and the next morning there are going to be pits in those fields. A goose just doesn't have a chance to land anywhere except on a protected area anymore. Our isolated bars on the rivers have been, to a large degree, eliminated by navigation control, and even where we used to have isolated bars they are now occupied by hunters. It's getting that way. It isn't that we are attracting them into a refuge, I think they're being driven into them to a large extent, during the hunting season.

MR. STEEN:

I want to add just one word, on this question of the control of the harvest. I think it is very clear that the control of the harvest of the Canada geese in the flyways depends very largely on the refuge system. I think it's very evident that in a 70-day season, with a bag limit of two birds a day, we could exterminate the birds in one or two seasons, if we didn't have some other form of controlling the harvest. I think that is demonstrated by what has happened in the Mississippi and the central flyways. In the Mississippi flyway we have a rather good system of refuges and this type of management that we have discussed shows that goose flock has been growing steadily. In the central flyway we don't have those things and that goose flock has been declining steadily. I think the evidence is clear, and I think we ought to follow the guideposts that have been indicated to us by our

experience.

MR. RUHL:

Anyone else have a comment or a question?

MR. SHANKS:

Mr. Janzen mentioned the phrase "quality hunting". Personally, I don't like that phrase. It's a matter of relativity. It depends on what you mean by quality hunting. What is quality hunting to you may not be quality hunting to somebody else. I think you're going to have an awfully hard time convincing a man from Kansas City who comes down to Swan Lake and kills two geese that that isn't the highest quality hunting he's ever had. It may not be to you or me who like to go out and hunt on a sand bar somewhere, but to him that's very good shooting.

MR. RUHL:

Fran, have you any closing comments? We could continue the discussion. I'm sure the boys in the Mississippi flyway meetings will recall that some of the southern gentlemen were a little bit concerned about us northerners drying up their source of supply. I take it there is quite a general feeling that there should be some systematic and planned dispersal on a constructive basis. I also think it's very clearly demonstrated there are some things we may not know about the Canada goose and that there are some aspects of which we are still groping for answers, one of them the question of distances. I think as long as we sincerely try to speak our piece, make our compromises and go about our way, I think things will be all right.

Unless you have some further comments, we'll move on to the next matter.

This next subject, Mr. Morgan's and Mr. Kimball's, is a question which is perhaps newer than the goose question, but I think is just as burning and just as complicated. The subject is "The Soil Bank Plan as it Might Affect Wildlife Management". It's to be discussed by Bud Morgan of North Dakota and by Jim Kimball

of Minnesota. Bud.

MR. MORGAN:

Thank you, Harry, and gentlemen. L. P. Voigt of Wisconsin will also be asked to come up here. He was invited to participate in this program, and if Jim Kimball and L. P. will come up here, we'll get started on this thing.

I want to make one apology before we get going on this. As Harry said, it's a new subject, one that we don't have all the answers to. To me, it's a very important subject, one that has a great number of potentials so far as the production of game, in primarily, the agricultural states are concerned, or those that are primarily agricultural states. It's one that hasn't been delved into very thoroughly even yet, I understand, by the Secretary of Agriculture, it's a bill that's divided into two parts, Title A and Title B. Title A is the temporary year to year part of the program and is designed, primarily, to take land out of the production of crops that are apparently in surplus. I don't think it's going to affect you or me as game managers directly. That'll be the one that we're primarily interested in, as I said, because of the rush of implementing Title A this year. Title B, up to now, has been more or less set in the background and we don't have all of the answers that we eventually will have. I believe it's important to discuss it at this time, due to the fact it does hold forth a lot of potential. Unless we are acquainted with it and unless we make our wants and our needs known as they are provided for under the authority of that section of the bill, the chances are we're not going to get the maximum benefits out of it.

Now then, your discussion committee has not had an opportunity of getting together and correlating our ideas and our discussion, since we arrived. Mr. Voigt tells me that he does not have a paper to give on the subject. However, I do know that he will add a lot to the discussion by just butting in from time to time and voicing his views. Mr. Kimball, on the other hand, is a ringer, a last minute ringer, I might say. Dr. Selke from his department was invited to partici-

pate in this discussion and at the last minute Dr. Selke found out it was impossible for him to be here, therefore he does what most administrators do, they toss the ball to the man who happens to be handiest and most capable of handling it. I know that Jim is capable of handling it, because of the fact that he's been in on this, you might say, right from its inception. So the committee has decided to ask Jim to read his paper and discuss it. Then I shall go through the Act, section by section, and point out what it might mean to you and to me. We're going to ask Les to feel free to interject any comments that he has at any time. Jim, are you ready to take off here?

MR. KIMBALL (Minnesota):

According to Bud's definition of an administrator, I too, must be one, because I had to toss the ball. The ball got here rather late and for the record I would like Mr. Dan Vessal listed as joint author of this paper. The reason is very similar to the reason given by Dr. Harkness yesterday: Dave wrote the paper.

SOIL BANK PLAN AS IT MIGHT AFFECT WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT

By: James W. Kimball, Director
Division of Game and Fish and
David Vesall, Assistant Supervisor
Bureau of Game

At the time the Soil Bank Act was still in the conference committee it was reviewed by representatives of various conservation agencies. These reviews indicated that the part the Fish and Wildlife Service and several states would play in formulating and guiding wildlife practices was not clearly defined. Therefore, a special meeting of the Midwest Association of Game and Fish Commissioners was called on April 3, 1956 at St. Paul, Minnesota. Through the efforts of this committee the Soil Bank Act was amended in conference committee and later passed in this language by Congress to clearly stipulate that the Fish and Wildlife Service and individual state game and fish agencies were to be consulted for

planning wildlife programs under the Soil Bank Program.

Although the A.S.C. will administer the Soil Bank Act the technical services of the Soil Conservation Service, the forest service, the land grant colleges, the state foresters and the other two agencies mentioned above, along with other appropriate technical services, will be utilized. This is a good feature of the bill in that we can expect to have a hand in shaping the fish and wildlife policies.

I think it is important that we consider briefly the declaration of policy of the Act in that it states that Congress finds that excessive supplies of farm commodities depress prices and bring about improper land use such as soil erosion, depletion of fertility and acceleration of water runoff.

In view of this congressional policy which has been written into the Soil Bank Act, one wonders if, in time, the federal subsidies and technical assistance for the drainage of surface waters to put more land into production would cease. If not, conflicting federal policies aiding and discouraging drainage will be in existence. In general, the policy of Congress as quoted from the Act is "to assist farmers to divert a portion of their cropland from the production of excessive supplies of agricultural commodities, and to carry out a program of soil, water, forest and wildlife conservation".

To accomplish these objectives the Soil Bank Act has two major programs, acreage reserve and conservation reserve. The acreage reserve program may have little effect on wildlife management practices because it is an annual type of a program designed to reduce crop acreages below allotment quotas. The fact that there has been wind erosion and drouth conditions in various states has helped to implement this program. Perhaps in the dry areas of the states it could be likened to some form of disaster relief.

From the standpoint of wildlife management, we will be more interested in the outcome of the conservation reserve part of the Soil Bank Program since it is designed to operate on more than an annual basis. However, it is questionable as

to how many land holders will go into the conservation reserve program because the payments are apt to be less than they would receive under the annual acreage reserve.

Since the conservation reserve program has not been spelled out in detail as yet, we must do some theorizing as to what effects it might have on wildlife management.

Under the conservation reserve program, the land owner must sign a contract for a period of not less than three years for croplands which he takes out of production and sets aside. The land set aside may be used to raise grass or trees, for water storage facilities, and for other soil, water, wildlife or forest conservation uses. A "fly in the ointment" is that the land set aside must have been used regularly for the production of crops (including tame hay). This will preclude the setting aside of important wetlands areas for wildlife which were never previously cropped.

An important stipulation is that no crop can be harvested except for timber, in accordance with good forestry management, and wildlife and other natural products. The lands set aside cannot be cut for hay nor grazed during the contract period. The safe nesting cover so provided for game birds will perhaps be the greatest single benefit to wildlife, at least in Minnesota, where safe nesting cover is at a premium in the pheasant range. Grazing will be permitted only when the Secretary of Agriculture and State Governors have determined that it is necessary to alleviate damage or hardship from natural disaster.

Farmers will not be permitted to divert lands or carry out practices on the farm which would tend to defeat the purposes of their contract.

The Act states that the farmer will be reimbursed part of the cost of establishing and maintaining forest cover, water storage facilities or other soil, water, wildlife, or forest conservation uses on land set aside. This cost includes labor. The amount per acre which will be set up for these conservation

practices has not been defined as yet. However, a total of $450,000,000 per calendar year has been set up to carry out the conservation reserve program.

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to enter into contracts for the period ending not later than December 31, 1969. There is one exception to this. The contracts for tree planting may run until December 31, 1974. No contract is to run for more than ten years except tree contracts which may extend for fifteen years. The Secretary of Agriculture may terminate the contract with the land owner by mutual consent if in the public interest or if the terms of the contract are not being carried out by the land owner.

The Secretary may purchase or produce conservation materials and services and make them available under the conservation reserve part of the program. He also may reimburse any state or local governmental agency for conservation materials and services which they may make available to the program. These payments may be made in advance.

The Minnesota Department of Conservation distributed approximately 14,000,000 trees the past year and is anticipating an increased production of up to 35,000,000 to 40,000,000 trees. Money from the Soil Bank Act may help the state in reaching this goal. The Minnesota Division of Forestry has requested a budget of $90,000.00 from federal soil bank funds for this fiscal year for this purpose. The trees that are planted under the Soil Bank Act will aid wildlife if wildlife managers can have a hand in laying out planting plans and designs so as to meet the requirements of wildlife. For example, protective winter cover in Minnesota is limited for the pheasant. It is important that our plantings be wide enough to give adequate protection from blizzards and severe storms.

It is indeed fortunate that the Midwest Association has written into the Act the clause for consultations with state game and fish agencies in formulating plans. As in the case of many public laws, the Secretary of Agriculture has the authority to prescribe such regulations as he determines necessary. This stipula-

tion can work to the benefit of wildlife as the states assist in developing wildlife policies under the Soil Bank Act.

One part of the Act restricts the leasing of lands owned by the federal government for the production of crops now in surplus supply. It will still be permissible, however, to raise crops on national wildlife refuges under cooperative agreements for wildlife purposes.

The drainage of surface water areas in Minnesota is still progressing at an alarming rate. The problem in our sister states of North and South Dakota is also very serious. According to one phase of the federal Soil Bank Act, no payments will be made for a period of three years from the date of passage of the Act on land newly irrigated or drained within any federal project unless they were previously used for crop production. This sounds like a deterrent to drainage, but I wonder how much effect it will have since a majority of wetlands in Minnesota for example have been cropped during dry years. In some states the Act may serve as an incentive for the construction of stock ponds and water storage facilities. Although the language of the Act is good in that it implies water conservation needs and may discourage drainage, it does not rescind previous legislation which provides for various types of federal subsidies and technical aids for drainage.

In summation, I feel that the Soil Bank Act will be most beneficial to wildlife management in the establishment of more and better safe nesting cover for game birds and in the establishment of permanent woody cover through the tree planting phase of the program. Unfortunately it may be that many land owners will not desire to enter into the important conservation reserve part of the program since they will be tying up part of their cropland for a minimum period of at least three years.

Although the Soil Bank Act may tend to discourage drainage, at least on paper, and promote soil and water conservation in general, the conservation reserve program remains to be spelled out, not only in the case of wildlife management, but

for other phases of the program as well. Wildlife men will have to work with the A.S.C. administrators and others interested in the program in order that the best possible coordinated wildlife practices be formulated.

MR. RUHL:

Since Bud is going to discuss specific items, I think we better do that before we proceed with questions, because the specific items he wants to discuss may answer those questions in advance.

MR. MORGAN:

Gentlemen, my friend Jim stole a lot of my thunder here. I was of the impression that his preparation for this discussion was very scanty. I think he's pretty well covered the field. Nevertheless, I think that it would be beneficial to go over this in a little more detail than Jim's paper treated it. In order to bring some of you who did not participate in that St. Paul meeting up to date, I would like to point out to you that the Act, as it was originally written both in HR12 and in the present bill, provided for the Secretary and his various committees to confer with other agencies. It was rather broad, it might have included you, me, and Fish and Wildlife Service. But, in North Dakota we have had an unfortunate experience in that we haven't always agreed with the Soil Conservation Service and we haven't always cooperated or received the cooperation that we felt would be most beneficial from that Service. There has been a little bit of jealousy and I personally felt it. I was afraid that unless a mandate was written into this bill which would provide that conservation agencies, primarily game and fish departments and the Fish and Wildlife Service, should be a part of the planning agency which set up and implemented this authority that we might be left out of it. Therefore the St. Paul meeting was called to which the directors of all the member states of this organization were invited. Most of them were there or had a representative there, and during that meeting we formulated an amendment to this bill, which at

that time was in conference committee, trying to get together on HR12 and the present bill that we have. We were able, through the efforts, primarily, of Dr. Selke of Minnesota, who contacted a Minnesota Congressman, who sat in on that conference committee, to write into that bill the directive from the Congress to the Secretary of Agriculture, which I feel is of vital importance to you and me. I'd like to quote that particular section, Section 109 of the bill which we are discussing which is HR10875. "The Secretary is authorized to formulate and announce programs under the subtitle B and to enter into contracts thereunder with producers during the 5-year period '56 to '60, to be carried out during the period ending not later than December 31, '69, except that contracts for tree establishment...." Wait a minute. I'm getting ahead of myself. Jim covered that. The Section I'm dealing with is 111. "The Secretary may purchase or produce conservation materials and services." The Secretary of Agriculture, and my interpretation of this means that the Secretary of Agriculture can come to you as a game and fish administrator who is carrying on a program of habitat re-establishment or habitat establishment in your state and pay you for the cost of having your technicians go out and actually blueprint the type of cover planting that you feel desirable for your wildlife. "Conservation services and materials and make such materials and services available to producers under the conservation reserve program, to aid them in establishing vegetative cover or water storage facilities or other soil, water, wildlife or forest conserving uses under contracts authorized under subtitle B, and may reimburse federal and state or local government agencies for conservation materials and services furnished by such agencies, and may pay expenses necessary in making such materials and services available, including all or part of the cost incident to the delivery, application or installation of such material and services." Then we get over to that portion which is a mandate to the Secretary so far as conservationists are concerned, Section 118, and I quote: "With respect to conservation aspects of any program under this title, the Secretary

shall (not may, but shall) consult with the soil conservation districts, state foresters, state game and fish agencies, land grant colleges and other appropriate agencies of state governments and with the Fish and Wildlife Service formulate the plans under which this authority will be implemented, I'm sure that we're going to be able to get a lot out of it."

As both Jim and I pointed out, Title A or the acreage reserve portion of this bill, I don't think, is going to mean too much to you and I as producers and managers of wildlife, because it is a temporary thing. It doesn't provide for permanent practices, which could be carried on upon acres that are contracted with the Secretary. Although I don't think we should completely ignore it, because, if properly managed, and if the practices under which those acres are handled are properly planned, I think it would provide additional nesting cover, undisturbed nesting cover for many of our game species. Other than that, I can't get too enthusiastic about Title A of the bill.

Subtitle B, Conservation reserve programs is an entirely different thing. I had the privilege, about two weeks ago, on a 6-day soil conservation meeting which was held in Bismarck in our state and touched upon this particular program of hearing some gentleman from the Department of Agriculture out of the Washington office make this statement: "That no part of this bill was designed to make the farmer rich or to pour any more money into his coffers than he normally would get." The first part of the bill is designed to cut down on the acreage with the hopes that the production of certain crops currently in surplus would be held down to the point where eventually we would get rid of some of these surpluses. The second title, subtitle B, is designed primarily to make it possible for landowners and operators to do with marginal and sub-marginal lands what should have been done with them down through the years. In other words, the farmer that has his farm under a soil conservation program has probably had it pointed out to him sometime in the past by a soil technician that he has 3½ acres over here in

the corner that is not the type of land that should be tilled; maybe not even the type of land that should be pastured; that, to coin one of their expressions, is actually wildlife land. This land would be more valuable in the production of wildlife than in any other use and that certain things should be done with it to develop it and make it more valuable to wildlife than it is in its natural state. Now that farmer, in most cases, has never done anything with it. He's considered it more or less a liability down through the years and he's just let it ride.

Subtitle B and the authority under it will make it possible for him to contract that piece of land with the Secretary of Agriculture and develop it, that it will have maximum benefits to wildlife, and that, again, is where you and I fit into this picture. We have been given the authority, it's a mandate written into the bill by the Congress to the Secretary of Agriculture saying that he not only may, but shall utilize the technical advice and the technical service of the various state game and fish agencies and of the Fish and Wildlife Service in establishing the best practices that are going to make this multi-purpose bill do the maximum job for wildlife. It behooves us and stands us in hand, to be in on the planning stage of this thing, to point out to S.C.S. and A.C.P. and the other various agencies that will be sitting in on that planning committee, those things which we consider are vital; which can be incorporated into the bill without in any way defeating its paramount purpose, which is that of banking fertility in the soil.

I'm going to go through this thing very briefly, because we're spending a lot of time on it and I hope there will be a lot of discussion regarding it.

Subtitle B starts with Section 107, terms and conditions. I don't think we're primarily interested in that. The producer will, of course, have to contract with the Secretary of Agriculture, and he will have to do certain things in order to qualify for payments under this authority. One of those things is: establish and maintain protective cover, water storage facilities, or other water, wildlife or

forest conserving practices. Now then, whether or not this thing is going to have a direct impact upon our big drainage program is something that I don't think can be definitely answered. I was interested in Jim's paper which more or less takes a defeatist attitude regarding that, because he and South Dakota and my own state of North Dakota and many of the rest of us, find that the agreement the Secretary of Interior presently has with the Secretary of Agriculture to the effect that no subsidies shall be paid for drainage on land which was not previously used for the production of agricultural crops isn't worth the paper that it was written on. During the thirties, in many of our states we farmed, primarily, the slough bottoms and the lake bottoms. Those were the only places that we could produce anything, therefore, there are very, very few of those that do exist that would not be influenced by that particular agreement would be the exception that proves the rule. I think that this bill is very largely going to take the incentive out of drainage, however, for this reason: that primarily your only reason for drainage is to make more land available for the production of food and fibre for man. Now then, we've had revolutionary thinking take place in this country, in the very immediate past which thinking is to the end that we no longer need every available acre for the production of food and fibre; that we no longer have the right nor can we condone the practice of farming and raising crops on 50% grades. I can think of no place where fertility can be stored to better advantage in the soil than in our slough and marsh bottoms. They always have vegetation enough in there to produce additional fertility. They concentrate the wash, the runoff from the surrounding areas in there, and are not needed for production at the present time. I don't know how S.C.S. or any other division of the Department of Agriculture is going to be able to stand up and condone and justify the expenditure of federal funds in carrying on practices of the sort with the thinking that has, apparently, been accepted at this time. Whether or not that policy can be changed, and I think there is a possibility of changing it, because I believe that that philosophy is

very vulnerable at the present time. I still think that the enactment of this bill is going to have a direct effect upon the amount of drainage that's carried on in the next few years.

The bill goes on to provide that he has to devote to conserving crop uses or allow to remain idle an acreage not less than that normally devoted to conserving crops. This means that the producer is not allowed to cheat by taking land out of production for food and crops, and then using the land which was formerly not used for the production of those crops to produce the same crops in a like volume; not to harvest the cover, except timber in accordance with sound forestry management, and wildlife. I like the fact that they included wildlife in that particular section, because I believe it would be a deterrent to the implementation of the act so far as wildlife is concerned, if we were not allowed to harvest wildlife. When all is said and done, why do we produce wildlife? It's for the purpose of harvesting, whenever we can produce it in surplus.

Not to graze, except under certain conditions, which we apparently have in some places in the northwest at the present time, only when calamities arise. When farmers and ranchers are faced with the problem of disposing of their stock due to the fact that pastures have not grown sufficiently to take care of the stock's need and they abrogate that particular section through a direct appeal to the governor of the state affected.

Not to divert land from conservation, woods, grazing or other use to a practice or use that would tend to defeat the contract, then it goes on with violations of contract and cancellation and providing discretion on the part of the Secretary. In return for carrying out the provisions of the contract, here's what the Secretary of Agriculture, under the authority agrees to do: "to bear a portion of the cost of establishing and maintaining vegetative cover or water storage facilities or other soil, water, wildlife or forest conserving uses on land placed in conservation reserve acreage." Now, there's where we should have a part in the planning

and we're really going to be missing the boat, in my estimation, if we don't. I think that we should have a part in determining the rate of payment for certain practices that might be beneficial to wildlife under this authority. To me, the whole bill has done this. In the first place, the Congress has recognized wildlife as an important national resource, which is constantly in great demand and short supply. They have gone farther than that by amending the bill at our recommendation. They have also recognized the fact that you and I as conservationists, do have some ideas and can make some contributions towards the implementation of this bill which would be vital, making it a better and probably a longer lasting bill. If we don't see that the incentive payments are established; are great enough to attract a large acreage, then of course, we're going to participate and we're going to receive just that much less from the bill. The question arises in my mind as to how far we would be justified in going, costwise, on a bill like that. I have given the idea some thought, primarily because of recommendations that have come to me from other states to what part, if any, P-R money should play in implementation of authority under this Act. I think it's entirely divorced from P-R money. I think it would defeat the opportunities that we have either P-R-wise or under this authority, if we were to co-mingle, and if we were to consider both of them as one and the same. We're doing a job, in many of these states, of producing wildlife habitat today that would not be possible were it not for P-R participation in the program. This, to me, is just another facet, just another outlet, just another opportunity for us to step up those programs. If we were to try and map P-R money to get the job done, to try and augment the incentive payments the Secretary of Agriculture will establish for carrying on some of these practices, I don't think we'd be accomplishing anything. Anything at all. How much time have we got?

Well, there are other things here that I had noted that I thought were worthy of discussion, but I don't feel justified in taking your time to discuss them at

this time. I'm going to submit to questions and I'm going to ask Mr. Voigt for comments. I would merely like to close by making this comment: that to me, we have a golden opportunity, one that we have never had before from the standpoint of doing something really worthwhile for wildlife, which has to have land, if we're going to produce it in surplus. What we get out of this, I think, is going to depend entirely on what you and I are willing to put into it, and we'd better be in on the ground floor, pitching, as of now.

MR. RUHL:

I think we should hear from Les Voigt.

MR. VOIGT:

I am a last minute in and out man on this program. I wrote Hayden and told him that, inasmuch as I was on the program previously, I didn't think I ought to be included on this topic, but when the program came out I saw my name on it, so I feel that I still can say a few words.

While the topic was covered in some detail by both Jim and Bud, I would like to make a few additional comments. The first point, as was brought out rather forceably, was that in the flurry to get the agricultural reserve portion of this bill going, the Department of Agriculture concentrated most of their efforts, and as was pointed out previously on this section of the bill, there was a series of meetings at which our department was represented, which the Department of Agriculture held which was devoted largely to the first portion of the bill. Now, it appears to me that the point of most significance as it's developed out of Title A of the bill as it's come out of the federal government, has been the prospective nursery expansion program. Now, our department was approached by the regional office of the Forest Service, like Minnesota, and asked to submit estimates where we felt that we might implement the bill through our nursery expansion. Fortunately, we were in a position where we had a program already formulated, which

wasn't quite as modest as the one that Ted Lawson up there put out. Instead of asking for 90,000 like they asked, without any administrative cost, we were up to 250,000 at the last rate. When I left Madison, John Deal was happily adding on more items, which he felt we could profitably use to bring our tree nursery program up to something over 50 million trees. We feel that is a very important aspect as far as Wisconsin is concerned in the utilization of the Soil Bank Program to tie in with both our wildlife and our forestry programs. Now as the two previous speakers mentioned, the rest of the conservation reserve program is in the state of implementation of the legislation, and certainly a little wishful thinking or crystal ball gazing is in order. With that point in mind, we drew up some rather succinct principles which we sent to Bud's meeting originally. I think they might perhaps bear a little repetition in what we as an agency would like to see incorporated into the administrative practices in this Act. I'd like to go over them just hurriedly and then perhaps, Harry, I'll be within my time limit.

These principles are as follows: This program should be carried out through established federal, state and local agencies, both in the interpreting and planning stages to coordinate procedures. State agencies should be given official representation on federal regulatory bodies in administering this program. 1. Each state should be authorized to operate its program to the best advantage for the conservation of local natural resources within the framework of the federal legislation. 2. The stage should assist in the program as to certification and compliances with recommended practices, but not enter into the enforcement feature. 3. Wherever possible, this program should be coordinated with the present established A.C.P. practices under the agricultural stabilization and conservation committees. 4. This program should include wildlife conservation practices under any conservation acreage reserve program which might be developed. 5. In wildlife management aspects this program should be supervised for technical guidance by the state agency responsible for such activities under the general procedures establi-

shed by the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 6. This program should not interfere in any way with the leasing program of public hunting or fishing rights so long as the activities are not incompatible. 7. Any conservation acreage reserve regulation under this program should not prevent the harvesting of timber from reserve lands if such harvesting follows good conservation practices. Then, as was done in this nursery expansion program, we cite that states should be given an advance in funds in order to assist them in tooling up with the manpower and equipment so as to cooperate with this program immediately. Then we make the point that financial assistance should be given to such needed things as the fencing of woodlands, marshes, stream banks and any other areas in the conservation reserve to assure that they will not be grazed. Under practices and regulations that we'd like to see included. 8. This program's conservation reserve, generally, should encourage the priority withdrawal of lower quality lands according to established land use classification. But, higher quality lands in flood plains or along stream banks or hedge rows should be an exception to this procedure. 9. On tree plantations under the conservation reserve program should require a 15-year minimum contract with a gradual reduction of financial assistance during the period of the contract and a recapture clause for payments or assistance given, if the contract is not fulfilled. 10. This program should grant equivalent payments to landowners who previously have voluntarily withdrawn acreage from agricultural production and established conservation practices within a period of five years prior to the date of the enactment. These principles were drawn up before the Act was passed in its final form. 11. Additional reimbursement under this program should be granted for the establishment of conservation practices on land withdrawn under the crop acreage reserve program. 12. The restoration of any wetlands or marsh areas should be permitted. 13. The program's conservation reserve regulation should permit the withdrawal of crop lands around springheads, stream banks, and lake shores.

Those are some of the principles which we felt were germane the time the con-

ference committee was being established, and we transmitted these principles and feel that some of them are still pertinent as far as regulations, which will have to be enacted under the conservation reserve portion of the bill. With that, I'd like to close my part of the remarks and we'll be ready for questions.

MR. RUHL:

I think it has been ably demonstrated that these three gentlemen have done a lot of work for you. They are probably way ahead of most of us in understanding the implications and seeing what the opportunities are. I am sure you have some questions or comments.

MR. EVANS (Illinois):

I just want to make a little comment on some of the contact that we have already had with the A.S.C. here in Illinois. It may be a little discouraging, if some of the opinions expressed prove to be true. About 10 days ago, we met with the A.S.C. administrators and with members of the A.S.C. committee in which we got a little bit of a preview of their thinking insofar as this conservation reserve is concerned. It is their opinion that acreage which was put into the conservation reserve is eventually going to have to come out of regular crop land. Now, by that I mean, if a man takes 10 acres of badly eroded lands on his farm which is now, maybe an idle area, may not be used for crops at all, but he puts that 10 acres over into the acreage reserve, he eventually has to take that 10 acres out of his tilled crops. He can take 10 acres out of legumes or clover, which are named in the Act as regularly cropped, but then he has to turn around and take another 10 acres out of his corn or his oats or other small grain crops and put that back into hay or into pasture. Which means that in every case, eventually, the conservation reserve acreage is going to come out of his cash crop acreage. Now, I don't interpret the two provisions in the Act to mean that at all. The reason for it is, of course, the acreage in soil conserving crops, which is idle must remain

the same on the farm as it was previously. It can mean just this, and this is their opinion here in Illinois, because of that fact, there will be very little participation in the conservation reserve program. They also figure that the payment will amount to $15 an acre. Not many people are going to put good corn land into a conservation reserve and get $15 an acre payment for it. If that interpretation proves to be true, we aren't going to benefit a whale of a lot even under the conservation reserve portion of the Act here in Illinois. Now I don't know if any other states have gotten that interpretation or not, and they don't want to see it work that way. They feel that the acreage reserve should be adequate to take care of production controls, and that the conservation reserve should be devoted to conservation aspects of land use. I think that probably is also what we want, and are very favorable to our participation in the program. I might just comment as to our cooperation with them on the acreage reserve. We had a couple of recommendations to make. As you know, if a man was to put, say 10 acres of corn or oats into the acreage reserve, crops which he had already planted this year, they had to be plowed under or cut off. We asked if it would be possible, in the case of oats for example, that the farmer clip the oats high, in other words merely head it and leave it standing which would provide a little additional safe nesting cover. That was very acceptable to them. As a matter of fact, one of the state committeemen told us that he had instructed all of his people to do that. So they have indicated their willingness to go along with us on that thing. We also asked that they be very lenient in the requirement that hay land which was put into the acreage reserve had to be cut, in order to control noxious weeds. They said that that was their intention; that they had no ideas of forcing the cutting of hay, just because there was a small smattering of weeds through it. I believe on the basis of those two things, we can expect good cooperation out of our A.S.C. people. As a matter of fact, they have asked for the forestry and the game divisions of the department to meet with them this fall for this purpose. They say we are always

asking for help from you people; we want to hold a meeting with all of the state people devoted to your problem, and we want you to tell us how we can help you. I hope that we can really carry through on that thing.

MR. RUHL:

Anyone wish to comment on that?

MR. MORGAN:

I would like to point out one thing that was brought out in Tom's discussion here just a minute ago and that is, again let me emphasize the influence that we can have. Illinois has done it. The particular section that Tom referred to regarding clipping has not been treated in my state the way it has been done here in Illinois due to the fact that the Illinois boys were on the ball here. The section says that a producer, in order to qualify, I don't know just how to connect this up, but the section reads as follows: "For such additional provisions as the Secretary determines are desirable and includes in the contract will effectuate the purposes of this title and facilitate the practical administration of the conservation reserve program, including provisions relating to control of noxious weeds." As Tom told you, the Illinois department has been able to influence the A.S.P. or A.S.C. here in Illinois, apparently, to take a very broad interpretation of what noxious weeds may be. In doing that, they have probably saved a lot of mess and provided a lot of rearing cover for birds that they otherwise wouldn't have had. In North Dakota they're still insisting that all crops that are to be paid for under the acreage reserve program this year must be plowed under, and there is where we must get on the ball.

MR. RUHL:

I'm sure there must be some more. Les Bagley.

MR. BAGLEY:

Just by way of explanation, we have been very much aware, in Washington, that all the concentration of the farm bank, Soil Bank program was going into this acreage reserve at this time. In fact, we had been told that they were not even thinking in terms of the acreage reserve. That has not been much a part of their thinking up until this time. Now, as soon as this bill was passed, the Fish and Wildlife Service notified the Department of Agriculture that they were ready with a committee to cooperate with them whenever called. Dr. Mehan was made chairman of that committee for the Service, with two other members. Now, with a little prodding to get this going, a meeting is scheduled in Washington today with the Department of Agriculture at which Director Farley is attending for this Service. I thought that might be of interest.

MR. RUHL:

That's getting close to the current happenings, I would say. Who else has a comment? Tom.

MR. EVANS (Illinois):

I just want to clarify this point a little bit more, Bud. The section which is involved, I believe, is Section 2. The one which says "To devote to conserving crops or uses or allow to remain idle, throughout the contract period, an acreage of the remaining land on the farm which is not less than the acreage normally devoted only to conserving crops or uses or normally allowed to remain idle on such remaining acreage". Now, the opinion I expressed was not mine. It was that of the A.S.C. people. It apparently works in this way: that the land which is put into the conservation reserve is more or less not considered an active part of that farm. In other words, it's sort of removed from it, and the acreage of the farm reduced by that amount, and that in order to maintain the normal amount of soil conserving crops or idle land on the farm, he has to take an equivalent amount out

of his corn or oats land and put that back into whatever use this piece was that he put in the conservation reserve. Now that's what they think is going to be the interpretation.

MR. RUHL:

I take it there are going to be many questions of that kind come up and this is only an illustration of the kind and variety. Has anyone else a question?

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Evans, I think this is just another illustration of where you can concentrate the thinking of the A.S.C. on Section 5 rather than on Section 2 in order to gain our point.

MR. RUHL:

We still have a little time on this subject, if anyone has anything to offer.

MR. JONES (Ohio):

I would like to know if this is retroactive in any way, or does it start now or does it start so many months in the future?

MR. RUHL:

Who wants to answer that?

MR. MORGAN:

In answer to your question, I am sure that this is a program that will be implemented and started not sooner than the next crop year. I'm speaking of the conservation acreage.

MR. SCHRADER (Fish and Wildlife Service):

I don't believe that I disagree with anything that's been said, but on the other hand I don't believe that you'll be taking full advantage of this thing if you don't take advantage of the opportunities that exist for farm game management,

particularly pheasant, in the acreage reserve program. We had our big pheasant populations under the A.A.A. program which was a similar type of thing, and there are going to be tremendous acreages of corn and wheat land that are going to be put into the acreage reserve right away. Now, there may be many opportunities for improving that land for farm game, even though it is a year to year basis. And for heaven's sake, don't miss a bet, any of you, if you have a chance to direct the use or the management of this acreage reserve land. I think Tom has shown an example of what can be done with the acreage reserve land. There may be many other things that can be done with that land and for heaven's sake, latch on to the opportunities.

MR. RUHL:

Have you any specific suggestions for motivating that idea?

MR. SCHRADER:

Well, I don't even know whether this is a very good idea, but I suspect that in many cases a farmer is going to take out 20 acres of corn, or 20 acres of wheat. If that's a square piece in one corner of his farm, it'll have one value; if you can get them to make it an elongated piece or a strip around the edge of a field, it's going to increase the value of that to wildlife. Perhaps some of the technicians that are much closer to this than I am, in recent years, may have lots better ideas as to what ought to be done with this acreage reserve.

MR. KIMBALL (Colorado):

I'd like to raise this question: I've heard, indirectly, that a number of these people who contacted the farmers have found that there's going to be a little bit of reluctance on the part of the farmer to take land for acreage reserve out of his corn and his wheat crops. I just wonder what the panel thinks about how acceptable this program is going to be from the standpoint of the farmer, taking his cash crop lands out from under production. Is that generally

going to be acceptable, or isn't it?

MR. MORGAN:

I think that's going to depend entirely on the incentive payments offered under the authorization of the Act, and there again, I think we should have a part in determining and trying to influence the various committees that are going to set these payments up on a state and county basis. They should be impressed with the value that has been recognized by the Congress, when they recognized wildlife as an important national resource. I do think that we have the opportunity and that we do have the potential of, probably in some instances anyway, increasing those payments to a point where additional acres would be contracted for that purpose.

MR. KIMBALL (Colorado):

Generally speaking, do you think that they will be paid on the same basis that they would get for the crop, if it had been raised?

MR. MORGAN:

Not necessarily.

MR. KIMBALL:

Less?

MR. MORGAN:

More. Depending upon the practices that they carry out. In the first place, I think we have to keep this in mind--that this conservation reserve is going to deal primarily with the marginal and submarginal areas rather than the high price crop land and the productive crop land. Your payments are going to be made, taking into consideration the soils types that you're dealing with. Now then, the amount of practices or the type of practices that are carried on upon those acres very definitely should influence the amount of payment. If we can impress the powers that be that set up these plans and incentive payments with the fact that

we are dealing with an important resource, very definitely I think that's going to have a tendency to influence the amount of payment, which in turn will influence the volume that's put under this particular type of contract.

MR. KIMBALL (Colorado):

Trying to put myself in the place of the farmer, Bud, don't you think it's logical that if they don't arrange for payment, at least equal to what a farmer can get for his cash crop, that he's not going to be interested at all? Let's say he's going to take 20 acres out of 160; that additional cost of farming that 20 acres is not going to be hardly anything. Unless you give him some incentive to enter this program, I think that you're going to find that there's going to be a general reluctance on the part of the farmer to even fool with it.

MR. MORGAN:

I agree with you, Tom. Everything is going to depend upon the incentive payments that are established and you and I have an opportunity of sitting in with those committees and influencing those payments.

MR. EVANS:

This question of payment in the conservation reserve acreage is one of the points I was trying to make. I think that it's quite definite that payment will not be large enough to be an incentive to the farmer to take land out of corn and put it in the conservation reserve which is what, eventually, he has to do if the present interpretation here should hold. Now if he can take it out of his idle land, and set it aside and get $15 or $20 an acre, he probably will do it. But if, in doing that, he has to put some corn land back into whatever use this other piece was in, then he certainly is not going to do it. I don't think anyone anticipates payments under the conservation reserve would be anywhere near what he could get off that land, if he did crop it. That probably is the point where we should step into the picture and try to get those payments as high as we can. Now, I have

asked the A.S.C. people this question, not with the idea that we're suggesting that we do it, but is it possible for the state to come into the picture and add an incentive payment? That might be all right for states that have lots of money and want to spend it on that kind of land rather than on their own land, but it is one possible approach that we could look at.

MR. RUHL:

Any other comments or questions?

MR. ?:

Is there a time limit as to setting up the acreage reserve?

MR. MORGAN:

Yes, there is. You mean in setting up the reserve? No, I don't think there is. As I recall the bill so far as setting up the reserve, there is a certain amount of money allocated each year and the Secretary will be forced to stay within that allocation, of course, in each of these titles. There is a time set up in the bill for determining what the individual farm may produce and still qualify for floor payments for the crops that he produces. But I don't believe there is so far as acreage reserve is concerned.

MR. RUHL:

When Bud mentioned that 450 million I wonder whether he figured three states wouldn't qualify--it was a million apiece. How did they arrive at that, do you have any idea?

MR. MORGAN:

I think they grabbed that one out of the hat, Harry.

MR. RUHL:

I am sure we could go on and spend much more time on this because it is a

current and new situation. I think we certainly owe a debt of gratitude to these gentlemen for the work they have done and I'm sure they're going to keep right on, therefore we should take full advantage of it. I think it's time, however, that we proceed to the next subject. Thank you very much.

The next subject, perhaps, is of less interest to some of you. I am sure it has more bugs under the chips than might at first appear to be there, and if Ray Beckman and Hayden Olds are present, we'll start the discussion. The subject is "Should States Inspect and Otherwise Regulate the Importation and Exportation of Bait Minnows?" The first discussion is by Ray Beckman of the Iowa Conservation Commission, followed by Hayden Olds of Ohio. Ray.

MR. BECKMAN:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Gentlemen. I might start off and tell you that when Hayden Olds asked me to be on this program, I told him I didn't think I could contribute very much information to this subject. I am sure that in Iowa we have our share of troubles, but this doesn't happen to be one of them that has given us very much trouble up to date.

SHOULD STATES INSPECT AND OTHERWISE
REGULATE THE IMPORTATION AND EXPORTATION OF BAIT MINNOWS

First, I want to make it clear that any thoughts or information set out in this paper are designed to convey only how any additional restrictions on this subject might affect our own state. It is not intended to in any way minimize or exaggerate upon the problems that other states may have on this subject.

The primary purpose of placing restrictions on the take of fish is twofold; to protect the seedstock of desirable fish and to provide the most equitable opportunity in the take of the surplus by the fishing public.

First, I would like to take up the matter of inspection. Is there a need for inspection and if so is this need of sufficient importance to offset the inconvenience that restrictions usually cause, plus the possible cost that might be

involved.

Dr. Carlander, Associate Professor of Zoology at Iowa State College, states there is always danger of introducing or spreading disease and parasites when minnows are transported. However, since most of the parasites may be transported by birds or in other fishes from one body of water to another he would question that the distribution of minnows would be a serious addition to the disease and parasite problem.

There is the point of introduction of species of undesirable minnows and rough fish into new waters. Our experience in our own state along this line has been that inspection of minnows has not proven to be effective. We have quite a number of artificial lakes in Iowa and our present law requires that all minnows used for bait in these lakes must be inspected. This, however, has not prevented rough fish from getting into these lakes. In fact, it is my feeling this regulation is a nuisance regulation and has not served the purpose for which it was intended. It resolves itself down to this fact that probably introductions of rough fish and minnows that are undesirable has been so general that much of the damage that could be caused from this source has already taken place.

Even though there was some justification for inspection of imported minnows if this was to be effective it would require inspection stations probably located near the state boundary. We have neither facilities, equipment or trained personnel to carry out such a program.

Our Iowa law provides that no person shall transport or ship any minnows for the purpose of sale beyond the boundaries. This law was passed many years ago and I seriously question whether such a law is justified.

It is the opinion of our biologist that there is no shortage of minnows in our streams except when the population is affected by drought, causing streams to dry up, freezing loss and loss from other causes over which we have no control.

We have no evidence to support any claim that commercial usage endangers our

permanent minnow supply. Very likely what actually takes place is that commercial operators take minnows from a given stream only so long as the supply is sufficient to make it profitable. When the stream has been seined to a point where minnows can no longer be taken in reasonably large quantities and in a reasonable length of time commercial operators will probably seek a new stream or a new source of supply.

Dr. Starrett's studies on factors affecting the minnow population in the Des Moines River indicate that flooding and heavy silt loads appear to be an important limiting factor in all species of fish including minnows. He has stressed the space factor as being a possible important factor in minnow population. He has indicated that harvesting of minnows by bait dealers could be greatly increased without danger to the minnow population. As a matter of fact, it would appear that in some years the minnow population in our streams could be increased if more of the minnows had been harvested prior to the breeding season, thus providing more space for new minnows.

Dr. Carlander has stated that he doubts that these same conditions can be applied to the harvesting of minnows in our lakes. He feels that the minnow population in certain parts of our lakes is held down by predation from pan and game fishes and severe competition for food.

Dr. Ed Schneberger, Superintendent of Fisheries for the Wisconsin Conservation Department, has stated and I quote: "As to minnow harvest we believe that minnow stocks in general in Wisconsin are under-harvested and under-utilized. That the major complaints we have received from transporting minnows out of Wisconsin have come from other states. Basically, the problem seems to be one of commercial competition in private enterprise."

On the point of importation we have no law prohibiting importing minnows. I am of the opinion there are very few minnows imported in our state for local use. There are, however, many truckloads of minnows transported through our state.

In closing, I would like to point out that at the present time we have a severe drought in about two-thirds of the state of Iowa which undoubtedly severely affects the immediate availability of minnows. Commercial operators in many streams blame this shortage on illegal take and traffic in minnows. It seems to me that perhaps we should place more importance on the public relations factor involved by providing more information on this subject to the public. If the answer does not lie in the direction of additional restrictions we should make every effort to so properly inform and educate the public.

Presented at Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners Meeting at Springfield, Illinois, July, 1956.

Ray W. Beckman, Chief
Division of Fish and Game
Iowa Conservation Commission

MR. RUHL:

I don't know whether Hayden is going to disagree or not, but I think perhaps you could present this point of view before going into the general discussion.

FACTORS AFFECTING THE IMPORTATION AND EXPORTATION OF

BAIT MINNOWS BETWEEN STATES

The assigned subject implies at least there are biological factors involved, but on the basis they are largely economic, I will dispose of the subject quickly.

Minnow propagators licensed to operate in a particular state are usually quite positive in their demands for protection from competition with minnow dealers licensed in other states. This reasoning is basic to most importation "problems". Minnows may be produced for bait purposes artificially in hatcheries or be seined from public waters. There seems to be less objection to competition from artificially propagated minnows than to supplies allegedly obtained from public waters at no cost other than labor transportation and the required license. Restrictions as to the movement of minnows commercially across state lines can be of the import or

export variety. The Constitution of the United States provides that: "No tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any state." Other restrictive measures must therefore be used. Furthermore, while the commercial dealer worries about competitive imports, the licensed sport fisherman becomes exercised by the commercial operator who seines streams to obtain minnows for sale and doubly so if the minnows are for the purpose of export to another state. The result is usually a confusing set of regulations designed to control both import and export. In either instance, enforcement requires the officer to check the permit under which the shipment moves, legal possession, source, whether pond propagated or seined from public waters, legal species, general condition including evidence of desease and possibly other factors.

At times regulations are attempted or adopted on the basis of prejudice or misinformation. For example - one of the most commonly propagated and used minnows is the so-called "Baltimore Minnow". It is a rather common occurrence for fishermen to request action to prohibit the importation or use of carp or goldfish as bait on the assumption that if liberated into their favorite fishing waters, they will become a detriment. Actually Midwestern waters have been exposed to such hazards, alleged or otherwise, for years and years. Definitely any expected detrimental effect should have shown up by now. Carp and goldfish are good bait fish and are highly desirable along with other minnows. Fishermen should be given as much of a choice as possible in selecting the type of bait they may wish to use.

Seining streams by fishermen to secure bait minnows for their own use is one thing, however, seining streams by commercial bait dealers is something entirely different in the mind of the average sport fisherman. It is a general rule to permit a licensed fisherman to collect bait minnows for his own use. Sometimes a possession limit is established based on the theory that the fisherman should take only what he can use. On the other hand, there is a constant agitation on the part of sport fishermen to prohibit commercial seining of minnows in public waters.

State game and fish administrators have a choice of closing all streams to the commercial take of bait minnows, closing some streams for the same purpose, or closing no streams at all. In Ohio no streams are closed to the seining of minnows for any purpose on the assumption that the liberalized fishing program in effect should not prohibit or inhibit the fullest utilization of the state's fish crop and minnows are a part of this crop. Also, to date, there is no evidence that commercial seining has materially affected stream minnow population. It might be added that the same individual who propagated hatchery minnows for sale and urgently requests regulations prohibiting the importation of minnows into the state is also likely to take a dim view of stream seining competition. It is not the user of bait minnows who objects to the importation of minnows from another state, it is the commercial operator.

Both the commercial operator and the sports fishermen are licensed by the state, therefore each have a right to expect that consideration will be given to their respective viewpoint. In other words, the responsibility of a state agency is to both the producer and user of minnows. The licensed buying fisherman should be assured, if possible, a constant supply of healthy, vigorous bait minnows at a reasonable price. If the local producers are unable to produce an adequate supply of bait minnows to meet the peak demand particularly in the Spring, they will necessarily depend on out-of-state sources to meet deficits. A bad situation develops, however, when non-resident producers flood local markets during the peak season of minnow consumption, pulling back to their home territory during off-season. This is known as "Skimming the Cream" off the market and naturally leads to ill feelings. In conclusion it appears that uniform regulations applicable to all states are not practical and that the situation must remain the responsibility of the several states. It would seem, however, that the most logical approach to the problem would be the encouragement of private interests to construct adequate facilities to produce a constant supply of

reasonably priced good type artifically propagated minnows.

Presented - Annual Meeting of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners.
Springfield, Illinois.
July 9 - 11, 1956

Hayden W. Olds

MR. RUHL:

Has anyone a question or a different point of view they wish to express?

MR. KIMBALL (Colorado):

I'll agree with Hayden on one point: that is, it should be left to the individual states, because I think that conditions perhaps warrant regulations varying between the states. Now in the state of Colorado we have considerable amount of trout water and had we had adequate minnow regulations 20 years ago, it's my opinion that our trout production would be even doubled or more than we have now. Our biologists have found that the introduction of carp and suckers in particular in our trout waters, and they are extremely competitive with trout for food, that, again, we could have had that additional production for every pound of rough fish we have now, we could have a pound of game fish. If they're already infested with rough fish, it's probably too late to do anything and nothing should be done, in my opinion, to impair the sportsman from fishing the way he wants to with bait minnows.

There's one other question, too, that I might add and that is, in the discussion of bait minnows, there was no one who defined, actually, what bait minnows are. Does that include the young of game fish and the young of what particular species? There are 10,000 that I know of, more or less. Now to give you an example of what I'm talking about, in our neighboring state, we have known a number of their trout waters being ruined by the introduction of what is known as the chub. We don't have any in Colorado, and yet, if we permitted the free transportation of bait minnows between the states, I'm convinced that within a very short time a good many of our trout streams would also have the chub in it. So

I think while a number of the waters have already been infested with what we term rough fish, that there's still additional species that could be detrimental to the trout aspect of it. Again I would agree with Hayden that maybe what's good for Ohio and Iowa might not necessarily be good for Colorado.

MR. OLDS:

Perhaps I should have prefaced my remarks with the statement that I was referring to the fish that inhabit Ohio. Actually trout are not a fish in Ohio, they're a luxury. There are a few trout there that are in waters that originate out of tremendous underground water springs and are usually in all instances tied up in private trout clubs, but speaking for the warm water fishes, I think I would hold tight on my statement.

MR. RUHL:

I wasn't quite sure whether you agreed with his exception or just weren't going to commit yourself. Mr. Beckman.

MR. BECKMAN:

I might comment on that just a bit as it refers to Iowa. We have several trout streams in the northeast part of our state, but the introduction of rough fish in those areas does not present a problem. It is not desirable water for those kinds of fish, so consequently we have no problem there. They stay out of their own accord, because it just simply doesn't suit them. In our own state also, we define minnows. Our game fish, so-called game fish, are not included as minnows.

MR. KIMBALL (Colorado):

Do your bait men know the difference?

MR. BECKMAN:

Yes, we think they do, very definitely. If I can add just another word, we

have enough confidence in our dealers. I might just comment on that a minute. We have enough confidence in our bait dealers that this year for the first time, in order to comply with our law that I mentioned which requires that all bait must be inspected that is used in artificial lakes, we are giving every bait dealer an opportunity to serve as an inspector. And actually, I believe that this will work out. To date this year it's worked out very well. I believe they are qualified.

MR. KIMBALL (Colorado):

We feel strongly enough about this problem of rough fish competing for food with our game fish, particular trout, that we've gone into a rather expensive program of poisoning our lakes for the removal of those rough fish. In other words, in the period that's gone by, we have lakes, which have high populations of carp and sucker in them and they are competing with the trout so we've gone into a rather expensive program of poisoning those lakes for the express purpose of removing the trout and suckers. I mean of the suckers and carp. Now when we plant trout back in them, of course, we want to take every step that we can to see to it that we don't have a reinfestation. In those instances, we've actually prohibited the use of minnows of any type--live bait, therefore that's another reason why we're particularly concerned about this problem of live bait and its use throughout the state.

MR. RUHL:

Has anyone else a comment or a suggestion?

MR. SPRECKER (Wisconsin):

I'd just like to express my appreciation for the fact that the two speakers this morning failed to point to Wisconsin as the horrible example of the big minnow exporter. In practically every meeting of this kind, somebody points to Wisconsin and says, "There's the culprit." I thought it might add a little bit to the discussion, if I'd tell you how we got into this big minnow production in Wisconsin. You all recall about ten years ago when everyone was trying to help the minnow

farmer; trying to supply a stable supply of minnows for the sportsmen who were beginning to feel the pinch of the shortage of minnows. We in Wisconsin, not only in Wisconsin, but in Michigan, Wisconsin and Minnesota, at the tri-state meeting appointed a minnow committee, made a considerable study of the literature on minnow culture. We came out with a minnow propagation handbook which was available to all of the minnow farmers in the middle west, and the United States, for that matter, because it was printed by the Fish and Wildlife Service. As a result of that work, a tremendous number of men got into the minnow farming business. Suddenly they discovered that in the state of Wisconsin there were several thousand lakes that were landlocked and were populated with nothing but minnows--rough fish minnows--fatheads and several other species of minnows. They suggested to the Department that we get legislation through which would permit the harvest of that tremendous, unused supply of minnows. We went to the legislature, and the legislature authorized the Conservation Department to issue permits for such bodies of water that contained little or no game fish. As a result, the minnow dealer in Wisconsin can get the authority to go in and seine some of these useless, landlocked lakes which provide no sport fishing, and harvest a surplus crop of minnows for sale. They found a good market for those minnows down in Tennessee, Ohio, Indiana, and various other states, therefore, as a result we became known as a great source of bait minnows in the middle west. Now as far as inspections of bait minnows is concerned, I'd like to call your attention to one other thing that we did in the state of Wisconsin. Some 10 or 12 years ago we encouraged a couple of the best parasitologists in the business, Dr. Bangem from Wooster College in Ohio, Dr. Nalt from Iowa State College, to come over into the state of Wisconsin and do some summer work. Dr. Bangem confined his efforts, primarily, to the study of parasites and warm water fish. After two or three years of work and after two or three years of writing, he came out with a complete tabulation of all the studies that he had made on parasites on warm water fish in Wisconsin. To make a long story short, he found out that they were 100%

parasitized. So if you're going to inspect any Wisconsin minnows, we can tell you beforehand, they are parasitized. I just thought I'd throw that out for what it's worth.

MR. RUHL:

You mean each one of them has all the parasites?

MR. SPRECKER:

No, but every fish has got at least one parasite.

MR. ROBERTS (Missouri):

I'm not a biologist. I'd like to ask Dr. Sprecker if there is such a thing as winter kill in the Wisconsin minnows.

MR. SPRECKER:

Sure.

MR. ROBERTS:

We have a commercial minnow producer in Missouri who has a million and a half dollars invested in his rearing ponds. I'd like to put this question to Ray Beckman, coming from the state of Iowa, I imagine he believes in protective tariff. Now, what would you do, if these Wisconsin minnows were winter killed knowing they provided the main source of your minnows in the summertime; would you put this guy out of business who is the main commercial producer in the state of Missouri, and you couldn't get sufficient minnows from Wisconsin and he's unable to produce, because you didn't protect him when you could have?

MR. RUHL:

Do you care to comment?

MR. BECKMAN:

Not very much. I think if I can refer that question, maybe George Sprecker

from Wisconsin would like to answer it.

MR. SPRECKER:

The situation in Wisconsin lakes is simply this: that we have lakes of all depths of water, about 3900 small, unnamed lakes in the state and the range in depth all the way from one foot to 30 feet. Your winter kill depends on the ice and snow cover in the lake--the oxygen depletion. We might lose 10% to 20% or even 30% or 40% of the population of minnows in those lakes in one winter, but I have never seen the year yet when we would lose 100% of the population in Wisconsin.

MR. RUHL:

Mr. Westerman.

MR. WESTERMAN:

I can't help but get involved here a little bit, perhaps, although I think in Michigan our minnow problems are more internal than external, in undertaking to regulate the taking of minnows within the state. Michigan's statute for a long while prohibited exportation of minnows, but importation is not prohibited and so far as I know, only limited numbers come in. One of our problems has been similar to what Tom Kimball referred to for his state, certain lakes that we manage as trout lakes where we have undertaken to remove unwanted fish. In order to prevent that reintroduction, one of our regulations provides that it is unlawful to use minnows, either dead or alive, in designated trout lakes. They're mostly smaller lakes and don't represent a large part of our problem. Another problem that we had to deal with in Michigan, and which George Sprecker referred to, in that cooperative arrangement worked out at the tri-state conference between Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan; I think a good deal came out of it in this handbook that's been made available to our licensed dealers. We provided one free to each licensed dealer at the outset, and I think it's been a good deal of help to them. One of our Michigan problems is that of providing adequate supplies during what we refer

to as the tourist season--July and August--when, in many waters, it's difficult to obtain minnows at that time that may be in great abundance at other seasons of the year. This is where importation is helping out. The man that the Commissioner from Missouri referred to, I know, has a station in Michigan and is shipping a lot of minnows into our state for redistribution to retail dealers. Another thing that's been done in our state I think has helped the minnow supply situation is to designate portions of trout waters from which minnows may be taken for commercial purposes. That is recognized, that Michigan statute defines trout streams as those containing trout of any species and that includes many streams that have a good supply of minnows. The regulation covering the taking of minnows from those waters only involves the summer season, when it is more difficult to obtain them from warmer water supplies. I think that's helped a great deal in keeping out and making, you might say, the minnow supply go around for the dealers, particularly in the lower peninsula of Michigan. I thought those comments might be of some interest.

MR. RUHL:

Hayden has a question I think he wants to ask.

MR. OLDS:

The question is this: Mr. Westerman mentioned that it was a matter--that Michigan prohibited the exportation of minnows. Now, you are referring to stream or wild seined minnows, not artificially propagated minnows. Is there any state that prohibits the exportation of artificially or pond propagated minnows?

MR. RUHL:

Anybody want to confess? Did you get that point, Fred?

MR. WESTERMAN:

Well, the Michigan law just specifically prohibits the exportation of minnows. Now I don't think we have enough production in Michigan, and a serious question is raised with anyone being involved in not being able to export minnows that he might

have available. But that's about the situation.

MR. RUHL:

Has anyone else a question, comment or suggestion?

I certainly appreciate your kind attention and the help of the people who appeared on the program, and I'd like to turn it back to our president.

MR. PALMER:

I believe Mr. Lester Bagley, Assistant Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service has a message that he would like to give to us at this time, from Mr. Farley. Mr. Bagley.

MR. BAGLEY:

Gentlemen, I can assure you that I appreciate representing the Fish and Wildlife Service at your meeting. As a result of the discussion last evening relative to the bill which proposed to split the Fish and Wildlife Service, it seemed that there were a number of questions that were raised at that time. So I took the liberty, this morning, of calling Director Farley and he advised me as we had learned last evening, that this bill passed the House yesterday. The Magnuson Bill, the Senate version of that Bill, was amended so as to include all the desirable sections which were in the Bonner Bill. In other words, the Bonner Bill was superimposed on the Magnuson Bill, and as a result Director Farley does not feel that there will be any question of or little question arising as a result of the conferees committee. He also advised that there was absolutely nothing in the bill, so far as he knew, that should cause any concern or alarm so far as the Department of Agriculture or the Forest Service is concerned. There has always been a contract agreement wherein the Fish and Wildlife Service and Department of Interior has done certain work for the Forest Service in Agriculture. That practice will possibly continue, but there is nothing in the bill that would affect it in any way. I think that's all I have.

MR. PALMER:

Thank you, Mr. Bagley. I'm sure the gentlemen are very much interested in your message.

May I again remind you, any of you who have read a paper here, if you will turn in a copy to Mr. Stites he will place it into the records of the meeting. I also want to remind you that at 3:30 there will be Department personnel with automobiles out by the hotel to take you out to the Conservation Area. A schedule has been made up here for field trips for tomorrow, if any of you wish to participate. We will furnish transportation for all. Here is a tentative outline of suggested trips. As we told you yesterday morning, any Conservation holdings or area or federal areas that you may wish to see, while you're here in Illinois, we'll be very glad to see that you get that opportunity. As a suggested trip, Trip No. 1, Illinois Natural History Survey Laboratory at Havana, Illinois in Mason County; the Rice Lake Refuge and Public hunting and fishing areas in Fulton County; Anderson Lake Refuge and Public hunting and fishing area in Fulton County. Travel time to cover these areas are approximately 6 hours. Trip No. 2, Calhoun County refuge and public shooting area and Pere Marquette State Park will take approximately 5 hours. I might say that Pere Marquette State Park is located very close to the area where the Illinois River flows into the Mississippi. Trip No. 3, U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service operated is the Crab Orchard Lake in Jackson County, and travel time will be approximately 8 hours. Trip No. 4, Union County refuge and public goose hunting area, Horseshoe Lake and public goose hunting area in Alexander County, including the Union County refuge, and will take approximately 10 hours for both areas. Trip No. 5, the Mount Vernon game farm in Jefferson County, which is our quail farm (and incidentally, we are raising what we term the California pheasant on this area), the travel time will be approximately 7 hours. Trip No. 6, Yorkville Game Farm in Kendall County raises turkeys and pheasants (and I might say God's country, because I live next door to it). It is located

50 miles southwest of Chicago, the traveling time will be approximately 7 hours. If any of you wish to see that area and are going to take a train out of Chicago, we can take care of it for you. Trip No. 7, Lincoln Trails State Park, lake development in Coles County, the travel time is approximately 6 hours. This is one of our newer lakes. It's pretty well along in construction and can give you a general idea, of what the Department is doing in creating new water areas for the state. There'll be department biologists who will be glad to assist in guiding you on these field trips.

I believe that is all of the announcements. Does anyone else have anything they wish to add at this time? If not, we'll stand adjourned until 1:30 this afternoon.

SECOND SESSION, P.M., JULY 10

MR. PALMER:

May we call this meeting to order?

Is there any old business to be brought up at this time? If not, we'll move on to new business. Has anyone any suggestions under new business?

MR. MORGAN (North Dakota):

Under new business, Mr. Chairman, only this: that there seems to be some question as to the present form of the bill that was discussed here yesterday dealing with the split in the Fish and Wildlife Service. Mr. Bagley made a report on that this morning and I believe Mr. Swift has something further to add, after he received a telephone call last night. I would like to have Mr. Swift called upon to report at this time. My reason for bringing this up at this time, Mr. Chairman, is that the Resolutions Committee does have a resolution that might be materially influenced by the report that we get on that bill.

MR. PALMER:

We'll hold the Resolutions Committee. We do have two other committee reports. First, we'll call on the Auditing Committee.

MR. SPRECKER:

Here's the report of the Auditing Committee of the Midwest Association of Game and Fish Commissioners for July 10, 1956. The auditing committee has completed a careful examination of the books of the Association which have been maintained during the past year by Mr. Sam A. Parr, Secretary-Treasurer of the Association from the state of Illinois. The books reveal that on January 1, 1956 the sum of $497.18 remained on deposit in the Colorado State Bank of Denver, Colorado. However, on October 25, 1955, Mr. J. D. Hart, former Treasurer of the Association, issued a check in full of this balance. This check is now in the hands of Mr. Parr, undeposited. In addition, Mr. Parr holds checks covering 1956 dues from the following states: Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, Missouri, and Wisconsin. Total checks in Mr. Parr's hands at this time amount to $672.18. Accounts receivable include 1956 dues from the following states: Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Manitoba, Michigan, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, Ontario, and South Dakota, a total of $350. Accounts payable include one statement only, from the Capitol Press Service, for stationery in the amount of $58.00. The net worth of the Association, therefore, amounts to $964.18. The auditing committee is pleased to report that the books of the Association are in excellent order. We respectfully suggest that a bank account be opened by the incoming Treasurer and all funds be deposited to that account. Mr. Sprecker, Chairman.

MR. PALMER:

Gentlemen, you have all heard the report of the auditing committee. Any comments?

It has been moved by Bud Morgan of North Dakota that the report be adopted and seconded by Tom Kimball of Colorado. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye." Contrary. Carried.

MR. HARKNESS (Ontario):

Following the meeting in Ontario, we prepared quite a few copies of the transactions, but I think one or two of the previous meetings had not been put in shape. So we had a big stack of these transactions in Toronto, which were sent to Denver. It may not be a bad idea to try to keep track of those and circularize any of the states with new administrations or new personnel that may wish to procure some copies.

MR. PALMER:

Thank you, Mr. Harkness.

I believe we're ready for the report of the Resolutions Committee and, as I understand it, there's one resolution that you're going to hold up for a little discussion first. Is that correct?

MR. KIMBALL (Minnesota):

I would like to express the very deep appreciation of myself and of the committee as a whole to Tom Evans for services far beyond the call of duty even for the host. He was not on this Resolutions Committee, but without his help I don't know how we ever would have got things all done up here and typed up in time. We have 15 resolutions, some of them pretty long and complicated.

RESOLUTION NO. 1

WHEREAS, public money or services are now being used to drain private lands for personal benefit at a time when surpluses of agricultural products exist, and

WHEREAS, there is no national emergency which warrants the subsidizing of such practices, and

WHEREAS, it has not been determined what effect said drainage may have on the domestic and ground water supply of a region, and

WHEREAS, said drainage of waterfowl and upland game habitat is destroying a great natural resource already inadequate in supply, while attempting to increase crop production without proving the need for added crops,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners in annual convention assembled at Springfield, Illinois, this 10th day of July, 1956, that:

The use of public money or services for the drainage of surface water from private lands be terminated, and that the Secretary of this organization is hereby instructed to send a copy of this resolution to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee in both Houses of Congress.

RESOLUTION NO. 2

WHEREAS, H. R. 8750, and other bills, proposing to amend Public Law #566 do so by eliminating certain restrictive provisions and,

WHEREAS, The elimination of these restrictive provisions may result in still greater damage to wildlife resources in the Midwest and Great Plains regions and,

WHEREAS, There is justification for putting greater restrictions on the type of work that can be done in the name of flood prevention such as drainage and clearing where the primary benefits accrue to the individual landowner by putting more land into cultivation and,

WHEREAS, Many local sponsoring groups and organizations have not shown any real consideration for conservation of recreational and wildlife values in watershed planning,

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the Midwest Association of Game and Fish Commissioners, in convention assembled at Springfield, Illinois, on July 10, 1956, urges the Congress to defeat all current proposals to amend Public Law #566 and to institute amendments which will curtail the destructive practices now planned in many projects and which will result in small watershed planning beneficial to all the people and to all interests.

RESOLUTION NO. 3

WHEREAS, H.R. 10875 (The Soil Bank Act), recognizes wildlife as a valuable and important national resource which is in great demand, is of great public interest, and generally is in short supply, and

WHEREAS, as Subtitle B (Conservation Reserve Program) of the Act recognizes the contribution which it is possible for the Fish and Wildlife Service and State Game and Fish Departments to make in furthering the multi-purpose values of this Act as they refer to game production by providing that the advice and services of these agencies of national and state government be utilized in establishing uses and practices, beneficial to wildlife, upon lands placed in conservation reserve,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Midwest Association of Game and Fish Commissioners in annual convention assembled in the City of Springfield, Illinois, this tenth day of July 1956, that every effort be made by Federal and State Conservation agencies, to establish sound land management practices upon these acres, to the end that the administration of Subtitle B of the Act be for the maximum production of wildlife habitat consistent with the banking of fertility upon these acres, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that members of this organization and personnel of the Fish and Wildlife Service be urged to attend the Soil Conservation Service Workshop, which is to be held at Lincoln, Nebraska on July 26th and 27th of 1956, at which time procedures will be developed for making the national inventory on soil and water conservation needs.

RESOLUTION NO. 4

WHEREAS, Conservationists long have been concerned with the effect both good and bad, of large Federal water development projects upon wildlife and fish and,

WHEREAS, It was intended that Public Law 732 (60 Stat. 1080) which is strongly supported by this Association would, through establishment of wildlife management areas, mitigate losses and permit public use of fish and wildlife where projects produced such values and,

WHEREAS, Innumberable areas have been made available to the States and the Fish and Wildlife Service for wildlife management purposes under the provisions of General Plans executed in accordance with Public Law 732 and,

WHEREAS, The National Congress has enacted legislation which permits the Corps of Engineers to reconvey to former owners lands which are not needed for the primary purpose of the project and which are not needed for public purposes and,

WHEREAS, The Corps of Engineers had ruled that retention of Fish and Wildlife lands does not come under the public purpose provision of the reconveyance legislation, with the result that lands now being managed for fish and wildlife purposes under the provisions of General Plans are in danger of being returned to former owners and,

WHEREAS, It is the firm belief of the Association that since the reservoirs of the Corps of Engineers were constructed in the public interest and at public expense, any and all

benefits to the general public should have paramount consideration and,

WHEREAS, There are a large number of additional reconveyance bills under consideration by the National Congress which would abrogate the original contract between the Department of the Army and the State and Federal conservation agencies, with resultant loss of investment to the public where development for wildlife has taken place.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED That the Association of Midwest Game and Fish Commissioners, in convention assembled at Springfield, Illinois July 10, 1956 places itself on record as favoring the passage of legislation which will provide for including wildlife and fish management and other recreation as a public purpose in reconveyance legislation.

RESOLUTION NO. 5

WHEREAS, The responsibilities of agencies sponsoring water development under Federal license have, in some cases, elected to place their own interpretation upon the meaning of certain features of the Coordination Act as amended and,

WHEREAS, Congressional intent seems clearly defined under Public Law #732 as it refers to land buying obligations of the sponsor, where such land acquisition is recommended by the Fish and Wildlife Service and State conservation agency for and in the interests of wildlife.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Midwest Association of Game and Fish Commissioners, in convention assembled at Springfield, Illinois, on July 10, 1956, urges that Secretary of Interior Fred Seaton be petitoned to use his influence to the end that sponsoring agencies acquire adequate land for production of wildlife habitat as a part of their project responsibilities under Public Law #732.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Secretary of this organization be instructed to direct copies of this resolution to Secretary of Interior Seaton, the Secretary of the Army, the chief of the Corps of Army Engineers and the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation.

RESOLUTION NO. 6

WHEREAS, the White House recently issued a press release indicating that the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service was to be separated into two Bureaus, one for fish and one for wildlife, and

WHEREAS, The National Congress is considering legislation leading to the separation of the Fish and Wildlife Service into two separate Bureaus, and

WHEREAS, the respective State Fish and Game Departments carry on many cooperative projects with the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service, including the Federal Aid Program, National Refuge management, River Basin studies, Fish Hatchery production and Migratory Bird Law enforcement and whereas the separation of the Fish and Wildlife functions will greatly complicate these cooperative relationships, and

WHEREAS, the establishment of separate Bureaus of Wildlife and of Fish will greatly increase overhead administrative costs, resulting in less funds being available for actual field work:

BE IT HERE NOW RESOLVED that this Midwest Association of Game and Fish Commissioners in annual convention assembled at Springfield, Illinois, this 10th day of July 1956 go on record favoring passage of the Bonner Bill (H.R. 11570) as passed by the House of Representatives, except that we oppose that section of the Bill transferring wildlife activities of the Forest Service and other governmental bureaus to the Department of the Interior. BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that we oppose any administrative or legislative action which will destroy the single identity of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

RESOLUTION NO. 7

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Midwest Association of Game and Fish Commissioners in annual convention assembled at Springfield, Illinois, this 10th day of July 1956, is concerned over the inadequacy of official action with respect to the growing problems of the introduction of exotic birds and animals, and does, therefore, petition the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners to reiterate its original resolution and recommendations on this subject to the Fish and Wildlife Service, which resolution and recommendations did envision efforts and activities at least four times as great in this field as the Service has initiated and maintained. It is the sense of this resolution that current activities are far from adequate and hence quite unsatisfactory and that this should be corrected forthwith.

RESOLUTION NO. 8

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED that the Midwest Association of Game and Fish Commissioners, in convention assembled at Springfield, Illinois, on July 10, 1956, again reiterates its stand against the proposed transfer of 10,700 acres of lands from the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge to the Department of Defense, and the Association urges the Congress to defeat the Wickersham Bill, H. R. 9665, which would direct that such a transfer be made.

RESOLUTION NO. 9

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED That the Association of Midwest Game and Fish Commissioners, in convention assembled at Springfield, Illinois on July 10, 1956 strongly urges passage of the Engle Military Lands Bill, H. R. 10371, which would curb military land grabs from the public domain and would require observance of state hunting and fishing laws on military reservations.

* * * * * * * * * * * *

RESOLUTION NO. 10

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED That the Association of Midwest Game and Fish Commissioners, in convention assembled at Springfield, Illinois on July 10, 1956 strongly urges passage of the Metcalf Bill, H. R. 1823, or any other bills carrying similar provisions and principals, to earmark a percentage of National Forest Receipts for use in recreational developments and fish and wildlife management on the National Forests.

RESOLUTION NO. 11

WHEREAS, many new and expanding uses of water presents critical and complicated problems of great public concern, and

WHEREAS, the trend is for greater and more varied water needs, and

WHEREAS, the legal rights of individual landowners and the public are not clearly defined in many States, and

WHEREAS, the current production of surpluses of certain agricultural products, the increase in human populations and leisure time, and the need for revitalizing outdoor relaxation as part of a sound national program to maintain public health requires, among other adjustments, more adequate provision for public recreation, hunting and fishing, and

WHEREAS, many conflicts of interest among water users must be settled by the State courts, and such a decision later may be used as a part of the thinking in settling somewhat similar disputes in other States, such local decisions may assume regional or even national significance, and

WHEREAS, the members of the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners are charged with a substantial part of the official responsibility for planning, developing and managing water for these purposes;

THEREFORE, the Midwest Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners do hereby urge the International Association to

(a) Arrange an appropriate place on the 1956 program for this important subject;

(b) Consider setting up a working committee, official employee or other arrangement to work on water law and its ramifications which affects game, fish or general recreation by such activities as

(1) Gathering and disseminating current information, briefs, proposed policy on water law,

(2) Pooling of legal talent in preparing briefs or advice bearing on

court cases involving public water rights upon request of any member agency or official and

(3) Formulating recommendations to the International Association on such items as water codes, attitudes or philosophy or proposed policies concerning water and its uses.

RESOLUTION NO. 12

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED That the Association of Midwest Game and Fish Commissioners, in convention assembled at Springfield, Illinois on July 10, 1956 that the Secretary is instructed to send copies of all resolution dealing with legislation to appropriate members of Congress, appropriate governmental agencies, private conservation organizations and to the President of the International Association of Game, Fish and conservation Commissioners.

RESOLUTION NO. 13

BE IT RESOLVED by the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners in annual convention assembled at Springfield, Illinois, this 10th day of July, 1956, that:

President Glen D. Palmer, Director of the Illinois Department of Conservation, be apprised of the appreciation of this organization for the hospitality and courteous cooperation which has made possible this successful and worthwhile convention, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Director transmit this expression of our appreciation to others who have so cooperated.

RESOLUTION NO. 14

BE IT RESOLVED That the Association of Midwest Game and Fish Commissioners in Convention assembled at Springfield, Illinois, July 10, 1956, expresses its appreciation to the National Wildlife Federation and the Wildlife Management Institute for the outstanding service rendered by providing current information on the subject of national legislation dealing with conservation.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the secretary submit a copy of this resolution to the secretaries of both organizations.

MR. PALMER:

Will someone move the adoption of the resolutions?

MR. MORGAN:

I move the adoption of the resolutions as read.

MR. T. KIMBALL:

Seconded.

MR. PALMER:

All those in favor signify by saying "Aye". Contrary. Carried.

We have another little matter to bring up before this group. We have heard that the State of Kentucky might be very much interested in being a part of the Midwest Association. I believe Mr. Tom Kimball knows about that resolution, and would like to make a statement.

MR. KIMBALL (Colorado):

Mr. President, I'd like to move to the Association that the incoming president, with the permission of the membership, invite Kentucky to associate with us as a member of the Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners. I'm sure you all know where Kentucky is, but briefly, how it tacks on to the midwest here is just below Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and just east of Missouri. It ties pretty well in with the organization, and since they've expressed a desire to join the association, I think that we should invite them. Mr. President, I offer that in the form of a motion.

MR. PALMER:

Do I hear a second to that motion? Mr. Beckman of Iowa, seconds. You have heard the motion. Any discussion? All those in favor signify by saying "Aye". Contrary. Carried.

Now may we hear the report of the nominating committee by Mr. Ray Beckman, Chairman.

MR. BECKMAN (Iowa):

I think most of you know that it's customary that the president be elected from the state where the meeting will be held. With that thought in mind, the nominating committee, composed of Mr. Palmer, Mr. Ruhl and myself wish to submit for your consideration the following officers for next year: James Kimball of Minnesota, President; Bud Morgan of North Dakota, Vice President; and Gordon Molen of Minnesota, Secretary and Treasurer. I move the nomination of these men as officers for the coming year.

MR. KIMBALL (Colorado):

I second the motion.

MR. PALMER:

You have heard the report of the nominating committee and the nomination of officers for 1957, moved and seconded. Any discussion? All those in favor, signify by saying "Aye". Contrary. Carried. The new president for 1957, Mr. Kimball of Minnesota, Mr. Morgan of North Dakota the Vice President, and Gordon Molen of Minnesota the Secretary and Treasurer.

Gentlemen, in conclusion, I want you to know that we hope that you people have had as fine a time here in Illinois and have enjoyed it as much being here as we have enjoyed having you with us. We don't want you to feel that you have to wait for another Midwest conference to come back to Illinois. You are all most welcome at any time, and we assure you that if you notify us in advance, we'll try our very best to make your visit here both pleasant and enjoyable.

In conclusion, again thanks a million to Mr. Olds and all the rest of you that worked so hard to make this convention a success and I want to thank you once again for all your support. To you, the new president, I hope that you enjoy it as much

as I did. At this time I think it's proper to turn the mike over and the meeting over to the new president, Jim Kimball of Minnesota.

MR. KIMBALL (Minnesota):

Gentlemen, I just wanted to mention one possibility and that is in where you might want to hold the meeting in Minnesota. I have been trying to make arrangements to see if we could hold this meeting at Itaska Park, but I guess that's not possible. There is a possibility--of course we can hold it in the twin cities--either St. Paul or Minneapolis. There is also a possibility that we could hold it up at Bemidji or someplace up in the north central part of the state in the midst of "good fishing". We could provide complimentary fishing licenses and perhaps hold it on a Thursday and Friday, so that there'd be some freedom afterwards. I don't know that we can do this, those towns aren't too big up there. I don't know about the facilities, but I just want to know if that sort of thing would interest you. If possible, would you much rather have the conveniences that do go with a big hotel in a big city? We might be able to get a resort or some such place as that. Does anyone have any views on that? Would you be interested in that sort of a meeting or would you rather have it right in town as they have been held?

MR. KIMBALL (Colorado):

Mr. Cousin President, if I can speak for one state, I'd like to get away from big cities, particularly at that time of year in Minnesota, and get up to the lakes somewhere. This is not a very large convention. Surely, some good resorts can handle this small group.

MR. ?

What about Duluth?

MR. KIMBALL:

Well, Duluth is a possibility. It's not--I wouldn't dare say there isn't good fishing around Duluth, of course.

Well, we'll pick a place and I only hope that we can put on half as good a show as Glen Palmer has done here. I think this is one of the finest conventions that I've ever attended. Every bit of it has been interesting. I know that he's had a powerful lot of help in Sam Parr and Tom Evans and Lew Martin and the rest of his boys and I'm sure I'll get that kind of help too and we'll do our best up there. But remember that I am pretty green at this sort of thing.

We'll entertain a motion for adjournment.

MR. KIMBALL (Colorado):

So moved.

MR. KIMBALL (Minnesota):

Adjourned.