

For waterfowl, we are one of the foremost states on the Atlantic flyway, with a plentiful supply each year of Canada geese, and canvasback, redhead and black ducks.

Normally, our tidewater terrain is the most important wintering ground for migratory birds.

Our farms and forests are an excellent habitat, too, for upland game—rabbits, squirrels, quail, pheasants, raccoon and grouse.

In Western Maryland and some parts of the eastern shore we have a fairly good supply of wild turkeys. I am told that last year we raised and released 2,100 of these birds for sportsmen to shoot.

In addition to our unexcelled fishing grounds of the ocean and tidewater area, we have good fishing in the rivers, streams, ponds and lakes of the interior.

Our Department of Game and Inland Fish has constructed some 25 community lakes for public fishing, and the department maintains cooperative agreements for fishing in all major impoundments.

The trout streams of Western Maryland are stocked annually with 100,000 legal-sized brook, rainbow and brown trout.

We are doing all we can to conserve and replenish the wildlife of our state.

Before I became governor this year, I was for some 17 years comptroller and a member of the Board of Public Works of the state, and in that office I was happy to have the opportunity to play some part in this program of conservation.

During the time, we acquired 40,000 acres of land which we opened to public hunting. In addition to that, our Department of Game and Inland Fish is developing another 150,000 acres of state forest lands for public hunting.

We hope to be able to buy additional acreage for hunting ground as funds become available.

All of the land was bought with revenues produced by the Department of Game and Inland Fish through the sale of licenses, fines and some Federal aid.

And I should like to say, incidentally, it is a great pleasure for a governor, harassed as most of us are by budgetary problems, to work with an agency like our Department of Game and Inland Fish.

It is, and always has been, entirely self-supporting. Its entire budget of \$1,100,000.00 is sustained by the money it produces.

Maryland is gratified to be a part of this Association of Southeastern States and to be able to cooperate with our neighbors to the south in a regional effort to conserve wildlife and enhance the pleasures of hunters and fishermen.

We pledge continued cooperation in this worthwhile endeavor.

To conclude, may I say again, in behalf of all of the people of the state, that we welcome you to Baltimore and Maryland and we hope all of you will visit us as often as you can.

## REPORT ON FEDERAL LEGISLATION

By CHARLES H. CALLISON  
*National Wildlife Federation*

The 86th Congress of the United States passed few new laws of special interest to fish and game conservation during its 1959 session. Most of the time it seemed to be trying out various potential issues for size, with eyes fixed on the 1960 election campaigns. A number of important measures were introduced. Some of these were the subject of hearings and made enough progress that they stand a fair to good chance of final passage next year. So the 1960 session should be most interesting, one all of you will want to watch closely. In an election year all members of the House and one-third of the Senators are in a position where voters can suggest they ought to "put up or shut up."

Here is a brief listing and description of bills affecting fish and wildlife that became law during the 1959 session:

S. 1575, a bill increasing the authorization for appropriations for pesticides research from \$280,000.00 to \$2,565,000.00 per year, now Public Law 86-279. This Act doesn't provide any money, it only authorizes it. This year Congress gave the Fish and Wildlife Service \$280,000.00 for pesticides research under the previous Act, and the Service is expected to ask for a supplemental appropriation—perhaps a half million or one million dollars—under the new Act as soon as Congress reconvenes. This money is to be used to study the effects of chemical pesticides on fish and wildlife resources and for research and experimentation to devise safer chemicals and safer methods.

H. R. 5004, a bill authorizing annual appropriations up to \$2,700,000.00 to the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service for research on the biology and management of migratory species of Marine game fish, is now Public Law 86-359. The language of this Act permits the Service to farm out some of the proposed research on a contract basis to state or local agencies. It is to be hoped the Service and the Interior Department will recognize and take advantage of this expression of Congressional interest to seek new and supplemental funds under this authorization in advance of the regular appropriations for fiscal year 1961.

H. R. 7631 was passed, extending indefinitely the earlier law which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior, through the Fish and Wildlife Service, to use certain surplus grains stored by the Commodity Credit Corporation for the feeding of waterfowl as a means of preventing crop depredations.

H. R. 5854 amended the Black Bass Act of 1926 to require that any game fish or game fish eggs transported in interstate commerce for breeding or stocking purposes must also have been legally taken. This amendment is Public Law 86-207.

All of you know by now, I'm sure, that the President vetoed a bill to postpone the date when the Coast Guard takes over boat registration in any state if the state legislature fails to act under the Bonner law. This means that if your state doesn't have a small boat law, the Coast Guard will move in as scheduled next April 1.

## APPROPRIATIONS FOR RESOURCE AGENCIES

In general, the conservation agencies of the Federal Government held their own or gained a little in appropriations during the last session of Congress which was pretty good considering the stress placed on balancing the budget.

Despite an Administration-backed move to slash the water-pollution control program, conservationists inside and outside of Congress were able to keep the appropriations for sewage-treatment construction grants at \$45 million. This was a victory for cleaner streams.

The U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service came out at about the same level, with a small gain for the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife, a small set-back for the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.

The Forest Service got an over-all \$2.7 million increase above Fiscal 1959 funds, including an extra \$100,000.00 for wildlife habitat work. This brought the funds for wildlife improvement to \$905,000.00, the highest in history but still less than half a decent amount for this neglected part of the National Forest program.

## THE LEGISLATIVE PROSPECTS FOR 1960

It is difficult to predict what legislative grist will finally become biscuits, but a good guess is that natural resource legislation will be cooking on several burners in the next session. One major conservation measure is bound to become law—or be killed by a veto. This is H. R. 3610, Congressman John Blatnik's bill to double the program of construction grants to help cities to build sewage-treatment plants. H. R. 3610 was passed with big majorities by both Houses and awaits only clearance by a conference committee before going to the White House. Many conservation organizations are now passing resolutions urging the President to sign this bill when it reaches his desk.

Other bills to watch in 1960:

S. 1262, the Reservoir Fisheries Bill, passed the Senate but has not yet had hearings in the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. The provisions of this bill are similar to the Marine Fisheries Research Act, except this one proposes an expanded program of research into fisheries problems in large impoundments.

S. 2086, to establish a National Wildlife Disease Laboratory, was reported favorably by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The Senate did not vote on the measure. The House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries held hearings on a similar measure but has not yet reported it. Controversy over where the laboratory should be located is likely to delay action.

H. R. 2565, the Sikes bill to authorize fish and game management programs on military reservations, was reported in the House and is pending on the House calendar. The International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners, as you know, passed a resolution at Clearwater, Florida, opposing this bill unless it is further amended to make certain that any special licenses issued for a military reservation will be issued by the state, and not by the federal government.

S. 812, to establish a Youth Conservation Corps, passed the Senate by a two-vote margin but has not even had committee consideration in the House. Unless Administration policies change, this bill probably would be vetoed on fiscal grounds.

Unless the Conservation Reserve title of the Soil Bank Act is extended, the program will die as contracts expire after July 1, 1960. Congressman J. Floyd Breeding of Kansas has introduced a bold measure proposing to add about 8 million acres per year to the Conservation Reserve until, by 1965, a total of 65 million acres would be taken out of crop production. It is calculated a program of this size would have a real effect in reducing crop surpluses. It would also create a lot of new habitat for farm game. Mr. Breeding's bill is H. R. 9059.

A simple extension of the present act for 3 years has been proposed by Congressman Anderson of Minnesota in H. R. 8766, and by Senator Dirksen of Illinois, S. 2335.

Look for continued efforts by conservationists, legislatively or otherwise, to eliminate drainage subsidies that destroy waterfowl habitat. The Reuss-McGovern bill, H. R. 3909, is still pending before the House Committee on Agriculture.

A new measure of particular interest to the members of this Association is S. 2460 and H. R. 8445, called the S. O. S., or "Save Our Shorelines," bill. This legislation would establish a system of National Seashore Recreation Areas under the National Park Service. National Recreation Areas, unlike National Parks, are supposed to remain available to the public for both hunting and fishing as well as other appropriate types of recreation. Some groups, however, will be trying to make parks out of such areas as Cumberland Island, Georgia. You will want to watch this legislation carefully to make certain hunting is definitely recognized and provided for.

Murray of Montana and a group of co-sponsors in the Senate, and Congressman Metcalf in the House, have introduced another new bill that deserves the study of everyone interested in the wise use of natural resources. It would establish a permanent 3-member Council of Resource and Conservation Advisors to the President, and a Joint Congressional Committee on Resources and Conservation. The Senate bill is S. 2549, the House companion measure, H. R. 8661.

There is a chance Congress might sort through several water-rights bills that have been introduced and pass some kind of new Act on the relationship of state water laws to federal rights and programs. Conservationists needs to watch out that wildlife and recreational uses of water don't come out with a dry creek. These bills are before the House and Senate Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A new Omnibus bill authorizing Army Engineer projects will be sent to the President next session. Such measures always hold potentials for both benefits and damages to fish and wildlife. There is a chance that the Kerr Reservoir Recreation bill, S. 159, or the similar but better Sikes bill, H. R. 6198, will be

attached to the Omnibus bill as a rider. The Kerr-Sikes proposal would make fish and wildlife and recreational values an integral part of the planning of federal reservoir projects. It could solve the problem of getting adequate appropriations for the needed wildlife and recreational improvements and modifications at such projects.

There will, of course, be some brand new bills of interest in the next session. Watch for introductions aimed at control of pesticide programs carried out by federal agencies or financed by federal funds, and new bills designed to improve the management of public lands in the west.

## OUR WATERFOWL RESPONSIBILITIES

By ROSS LEFFLER

*Assistant Secretary of the Interior*

This is the second time I have had the privilege of addressing the annual conference of your Association. Two years ago, I took advantage of the opportunity of a similar meeting to lay down the basic principles of a philosophy which I deem is vital to the successful discharge of the fish and wildlife duties of the States and the Federal Government—the partnership approach.

What I had to say two years ago related generally to the research and management activities of our Government agencies in the fish and wildlife field.

Today, I want to get down to a specific—our waterfowl responsibilities—with particular attention to the waterfowl harvest. In this discussion, I want to deal not only with the responsibilities of our various professional conservation agencies, but also with the obligations which must be borne by the public if we are to have good husbandry for the resource upon which such an important recreational activity depends. By the public, I mean all people interested in wildlife resources in one way or another.

This is a timely subject. We're now in the annual period for gripes about the restrictions in the waterfowl hunting regulations. This occurs both in the lean and the fat years. No matter how much you liberalize, there are some who still complain each year.

For this complaining citizen there are just two courses of action. Either acquaint him with the plain facts of life about waterfowl conservation so that he will see how much disservice he is doing the cause of hunters generally, or just forget about him and keep conscientiously on your sound management course. I prefer the former because we need every ally we can get in our business; and a reformed character, you know, is always a real evangelist. Besides, we have a basic obligation in Government to provide people with a clear understanding of our conservation program.

Let's take a look at the current situation. We're now dealing with a declining waterfowl population. Drought conditions in the main "duck factory" in the prairies expanded drastically this year. Many birds were forced out of their regular nesting territory and moved northward into lower quality range where they would be expected to produce fewer young under the best conditions. But, this year they encountered unfavorable weather in the north and even fewer young could be produced.

The Fish and Wildlife Service's Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife conducted its usual comprehensive nesting ground surveys—inventories of production demonstrated statistically adequate to indicate correctly the kind of a crop to be expected for the hunting harvest.

Calling a spade a spade, the Service then forecast a serious decline in the supply of birds from the high of several years ago and recommended conservative seasons in order to return an adequate supply of nesters to the breeding grounds to implement the waterfowl recovery when conditions once again become favorable. There was consultation with Flyway Councils and with other advisers, and discussions with Canadian officials. Finally, the regulations were