

interest in hunting and fishing as a sport or for relaxation. The national forests of the South will continue to have a relatively small but important part in furnishing such relaxation for sportsmen.

On many national forest units there is now food and habitat for more wildlife. The deer population and harvest could be increased now as much as four to ten times in many places.² The turkey population could be increased many fold. All national-forest land should fully contribute to wildlife management to the extent of its ability and compatibility with other values and uses. The goal should be more research, a well-informed public, a desire for and strict law enforcement, and intensive wildlife management on each and every unit.

The goal can be reached by all of us continuing to work together. There are many more opportunities to coordinate our efforts—obtaining of facts, arriving at a mutual understanding, and carrying forward sound programs on the ground. It is good to get around the table, write to each other, or talk to each other; but there is no substitute for working together on programs and management practices on the ground or in the woods. We in the Forest Service solicit your continuing sound advice and counsel. We need more research and facts. We need your technical help. We have joint objectives and interests. We must cooperatively and harmoniously work together on an enlarged scale in the woods on each and every unit. By so doing we can make sound and worthwhile progress that will make the best use of all forest land resources and satisfy man's need to the extent of those available resources.

FISH AND WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AND THE SOIL BANK ACT

By LESTER BAGLEY

Assistant Director, Fish and Wildlife Service
Washington, D. C.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much this opportunity to appear before the Southeastern Conference. I presume you are aware that I am pinch hitting for Dr. Meehan who was originally scheduled to give this talk. Dr. Meehan asked me to express his regrets that he is unable to be with you today. I assure you it is a genuine pleasure to take his place and represent the Washington Office of the Fish and Wildlife Service at this meeting. Inasmuch as the assignment was given to me on short notice with little time for detailed preparation, my talk will deal chiefly with broad aspects of the assigned topic.

The Agricultural Act of 1956 was passed on May 28, this year. Title I of this Act is the Soil Bank Act which authorizes the Soil Bank program. I can assure you that during this time, and even before passage of the Act, the Fish and Wildlife Service has been very busy helping to lay the groundwork for inclusion of a strong wildlife program, and assisting in the preparation of regulations to cover wildlife practices on reserved lands. Right now, our Service is in the midst of finalizing a Memorandum of Understanding between Interior and Agriculture, which we hope will spell out the details of who does what in the wildlife phase of the program in a manner satisfactory to all concerned.

From a personal point of view, I believe this Soil Bank Act is very important legislation from a wildlife standpoint, perhaps the most important since the Federal Aid to Wildlife Act became law. Let me say further that if—and this is a big if—if the State fish and game departments are given the opportunity to participate actively in the program, the wildlife work permitted under the Soil Bank program can easily result in habitat improvements on a scale never before known in our time. But at the same time let me caution you not to expect miracles from the program. We must remember that wildlife improvements are permitted only on lands placed in the "bank," and that such lands must have been in agricultural production during the year immediately preceding

² From 2 papers (and other sources): Barick, F. B. 1951—Paper presented 5th Annual meeting Southeastern Game and Fish Commissioners; Hickie, P. 1954—U. S. Dept. of Interior Wildlife Leaflet No. 364.

the farmer's soil-bank contract. In other words, Soil Bank funds cannot be used to improve conditions for wildlife on existing marshes, brushlands, woodlots, and other areas not used for crop production during the previous year. They can be used, however, to create such areas on present agricultural lands.

Now for some highlights on developments affecting the wildlife phases of the program. I cannot say what person or what organization had the most influence in getting wildlife so fully considered in the authorizing language of the Soil Bank Act itself. No doubt it was the combined efforts of certain key people—private individuals, officers of aggressive State fish and game departments, and some of the better known private wildlife organizations. Although I cannot give credit where credit is due, I can pay tribute to those people who worked diligently to make the Soil Bank Act an effective instrument for expansion and improvement of wildlife habitat. The word *wildlife* is written at least nine times in the terms of the Soil Bank Act, and the State game and fish agencies and the Fish and Wildlife Service are specifically mentioned as agencies whose technical resources shall be utilized to assure coordination of conservation activities and a solid technical foundation for the program. The Act also states that our agencies shall be consulted in the formulation of program provisions at the State and county levels. No language could be clearer than this.

Back in January of this year, four months before passage of the Agricultural Act of 1956, the Secretary of the Interior wrote to the Secretary of Agriculture expressing his interest and the interest of the Fish and Wildlife Service in the wildlife-conservation potentials inherent in the proposed Soil Bank legislation. He also offered to the Department of Agriculture the technical facilities of the Fish and Wildlife Service in formulating provisions to develop these potentials. On March 14, Director Farley established in the Central Office of the Service a Soil Bank Committee comprising representatives of the several interested Branches, and chaired by Dr. Meehan. Shortly thereafter similar committees were set up in each Regional Office of the Service. The duties of these committees were to study proposed Soil Bank legislation, and to develop recommendations for implementing the wildlife phases of whatever program the Congress and the President might authorize.

Following enactment of the Agriculture Act of 1956, a series of six meetings were held between representatives of the Department of Agriculture—principally CSS, ACPS, SCS, FS,* and the new Soil Bank Division—and representatives of the Fish and Wildlife Service, to develop specific language which would recognize the important role of wildlife conservation in the regulations being formulated to govern the Conservation Reserve part of the program. At these meetings we sometimes made hits, and sometimes we struck out, but neither side let a called third strike go by. Of course, the game is not yet over.

Perhaps the principal contribution of these meetings, aside from getting wildlife language inserted here and there, was the establishment of three practices which are designed specifically to create or improve fish and wildlife habitats. Possibly many of you are familiar with these practices by this time. They are: G-1. Establishment and management of cover specifically beneficial to wildlife; G-2. Water and marsh management to benefit fish and wildlife; G-3. Constructing dams or ponds for fish. Within these broad categories, State fish and game departments can spell out more precisely the types of projects and types of materials needed to apply habitat improvement to their particular States, and to particular counties within their States. The Departments will deal directly with State Soil Bank Committees and county ASC Committees to propose specific wildlife practices.

The next significant step in this brief history was developed at the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners at Toronto, last month. The Association passed a resolution listing six proposals which its members thought would strengthen the wildlife phases of the Soil Bank program.

* CSS—Commodity Stabilization Service. Has overall administration of the program.
ACPS—Agricultural Conservation Program Service. Has responsibility for practices carried out under the program.
SCS—Soil Conservation Service. FS—Forest Service.
Both are responsible for the technical expertness of the program.

The Secretary of Agriculture was asked to act favorably on them. We are hopeful that when these recommendations have been fully considered in the light of responsibilities of State fish and game directors for the welfare of wildlife in their respective States, action by the Secretary of Agriculture will be favorable.

In this connection may I point out that a State Director has every right to a voice in determining wildlife practices for his State, as well as the opportunity to assist in carrying them out under the Soil Bank program. He is dealing with public resources in which all citizens of his State have a vested interest. I am not unmindful that in many States the Soil Conservation Service has done an excellent job in carrying out wildlife management practices, yet it seems to me that State fish and game departments are ideally set up to take on the lion's share of responsibility in Soil Bank wildlife programs.

State conservation departments are staffed with men who are technically trained to recommend, help install, and follow through on fish and wildlife practices. In most states, district wildlife managers are available to offer the very type of technical service the Soil Bank Act says should be sought. I am a State's righter myself, and, in my opinion, the State-employed administrators and biologists should be given the green light to participate actively in the program by assuming technical responsibilities to the extent that their resources will permit. As yet, we do not have this green light. And if we do get it, some States may elect to have the Soil Conservation Service take over the technical part of wildlife work. This should be their prerogative.

As a former State Director it has been revealing to me to learn that many months of conference, phone calls and letters seem to be required in order to prepare regulations and a cooperative Memorandum of Understanding between two Federal Departments. I suppose we must realize the difficulty involved when two Departments with different interests and responsibilities are asked to get together for a united cause. Too, we are dealing here with a rather new concept in land use, and it is very important that all details be worked out as carefully as possible. Secretarial decisions are involved. It all takes time.

In closing, I wish to point out at least two overall benefits to fish and wildlife conservation which are inherent in the Soil Bank program. *First*—we have established the principle that it is no longer necessary to get maximum production from every acre of agricultural land. This principle, by itself, will help in our plea for more consideration of wildlife in our publicly supported agricultural programs. *Second*—for the first time in our history, an agricultural program has recognized fish and wildlife production as a land use worthy of receiving encouragement through the expenditure of public funds. This sets a precedent for applying to lands in private ownership the same multiple-use concept that now characterizes land use programs on public lands.

GENERAL GAME SESSION

THE BIOLOGIST AND PUBLIC RELATIONS

By MATT H. WHISENHUNT

Project Leader, Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission

Tallahassee, Florida

It is generally accepted that any large enterprise such as our state game and fish departments must function in three major phases: Administrative, technical, and public relations. All three must be well synchronized to perform the tasks of today's state game and fish departments. Most Southeastern states can boast of their administrative and technical phases, but there the boasting stops. Without a known exception, every state has a bottleneck between the technical phase