

be non-existent. Without law enforcement, Federal Aid funds would be greatly reduced. These losses in revenue would greatly curtail research, development, management and education. Few Fish and Wildlife Departments could employ the technical staffs that they now maintain. So, we biologists are to a large extent dependent on law enforcement personnel.

I would like to point out that the law enforcement staff and technical staff are all working toward the same end. We biologists can make our jobs much easier through cooperation with these men, and most of them are anxious to cooperate if they know what we want. But remember two things:

If we expect cooperation on their part, we must do our part to cooperate with them whenever we can. Some technical employees believe that they should not assist law enforcement personnel as it might interfere with their obtaining necessary data. I cannot go along with this line of thought, but if you believe so, the least you can do is to go out with your law enforcement personnel, even though you only sit in the car and keep them company. We cannot expect all the cooperation to be on the part of our law enforcement officers.

And last, but not least, be quick to praise, but slow to criticize, as our Departments could not carry out an effective Game and Fish Conservation Program if it were not for our enforcement personnel.

GENERAL GAME SESSION

(Not all papers available)

PUBLIC HUNTING AREAS IN THE SOUTHEAST

LOUIS F. GAINNEY, *Chairman*, Florida

RAYMOND MOODY, Louisiana

ROLLAND HANDLEY, Mississippi

HAROLD WARVEL, Tennessee

The discussion briefly followed this order: (1) acquisition, (2) operation and administration. The members from each represented state on the panel described briefly their program and how it operated. There was little discussion on acquisition. The discussion soon came to checking stations. There was considerable discussion from the panel and audience about the need and value of checking stations.

The consensus of opinion was that checking stations were of value for collecting information, a public relations measure, and a selling point to the landowners. The disadvantages were cost of operations, difficulty of getting good checking station operators and once this system is started the public and landowners demand that it be kept in operation.

The information collected is kill data, hunting pressure, and specimens for aging game killed and food habits. Deer ages weights and food habits may be obtained from this system. The same data may be collected on turkeys in addition to sex and age ratios. The public relations point is controversial. This gives the state agency a good opportunity to pass out information that would not be available to all otherwise. In the minds of most hunters the checking stations are set up as a law enforcement tool and that it keeps the other hunters straight so therefore they are willing to abide by the law themselves. The landowners feel that it cuts down on timber and cattle theft and is therefore of value to them.

The opinion was that if you have it you will probably have to live with the checking stations but if you do not have this system, weigh all the pros and cons carefully before deciding.