reflected in large numbers of drownings which, at the present time, far outnumber gunning accidents.

In Tennessee, we now are producing our second water safety film for both TV and group use. Our officers make weekly checks with County Coroners and report drownings, which are carried regularly in "Box Score" press releases. We have distributed many radio tapes, presented demonstrations and made talks on the subject.

The Water Safety Congress, which originated in the Southeast, performs a valuable liaison function and participation by other States is invited and urged. The next national convention of the Congress, by the way, will be held at Mobile in May and many States should consider sending representatives.

Like the growth of a child, progress is difficult to note in day-by-day activities. A glance back at the comparatively short existence of the Southeastern Association, however, will reveal many accomplishments. We certainly wish and hope that everyone present at this convention will learn facts of value and return to their respective tasks and projects with dedicated resolve.

I would also like for each of you to go back home with a quote from one of Edmond Burke's speeches as a guide line for everything we do in the field of natural resource conservation. That quote is as follows:

> "An unwritten compact between the dead, the living, and the unborn requires that we leave the unborn something more than debts and depleted natural resources."

Thank you very much for your kind attention.

## THE CONSERVATION PARTNERSHIP

*By* Ross Leffler

*Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior*

What I have to say today will not take all of the time you have so generously allotted me. I am being brief not because I feel the subject lacks significance to merit a long speech, but in the hope brevity will give my remarks greatest possible emphasis.

My subject is most important because of the difficult problem which lies ahead of us. Our heritage of abundant wildlife and public recreation dependent upon it is in a critical situation. I do not need to stress this point to you. There is an awareness in this audience—as well as among people generally—of the mounting threats to fish and wildlife values. By the hand of man, moved by the force of an American population growth at a pace which startles us, living space for wildlife is being transformed—many times unnecessarily—into sites for housing and industries and sometimes into areas for sewage, waste or trash disposal. We also have lands taken out of wildlife use for transportation, power, clothing and food. We have conflicts for water supplies and water uses which are growing more and more complex.

Don't get the impression I have the philosophy of a Canute commanding that there be no progress. That we must have if America is to maintain its position, but it should be achieved without loss of fish and wildlife values. Nor should you try to find in my remarks the slightest desire to perpetuate the arguments which have long split many of the governmental agencies involved in resource management. In my opinion, all that has been accomplished by this senseless feuding has been the retarding of progress. In words so widely used over the years by foes of bigotry: "There are many roads up the mountain, but only one moon shines on the top." Similarly, there are many ways to carry on good conservation practices, but only one goal: To preserve for those who come after us the opportunity to enjoy the rich heritage of natural resources which have made possible our way of life.

You will note that I am not saying good soil and water conservation are enough to insure fish and wildlife conservation, or that you can have the latter without the former. Neither am I using the shopworn expression that con-

servation is wise use. Sometimes in our business, it may not be wise use to use at all. Circumstances will define such prescriptions. Actually, our resource management to be successful and meet all public needs now and in the future must be a balanced program in which are integrated all of our conservation practices with none advanced at the expense of the other.

To attain that objective at the earliest possible moment—because delays cost us valuable ground—I again say: Let's forget the mistakes of the past by our various agencies, stop being "agin-ers" and start developing answers to our resource problems which we are all *for*.

I am not a purveyor of panaceas; thus you do not find me here proposing answers to this, that or the other problem which is confronting us in the fish and wildlife field. Development of those answers is the job of our trained personnel in research and management, and I don't mean just those who work for the federal government, although—bless them—those boys do a real job for us, and they don't get rich at it either, unfortunately.

It is my role in the Secretarial family in Interior to discuss and develop policy for Department adoption which will stimulate progressive fish and wildlife thinking and encourage its application in management by all agencies and individuals everywhere and on the scale the future demands.

As I have said before, ours is a most complex problem. We must promote the preservation of land and water habitat for fish and wildlife as a long-range investment by any and every means possible—acquisition, easement, lease, incentive or what-have-you. We must speed research to develop management techniques which produce more fish and wildlife on the areas still available. We must help other agencies make similar advances so their products from the land can be supplied in greater quantities from less area, too, and thus reduce competition for the living space needed by fish and wildlife. There are many other interrelated problems also requiring study and action.

How can we best accomplish all these tasks? That question leads me to the heart of what I have to say today. It involves a most important federal fish and wildlife policy. I have mentioned it a number of times; Secretary Seaton has referred to it, also. Usually our comments have been incidental to generalized discussions of our program planning. I feel, however, that it is so important, so vital to our success, that it should be discussed in detail and thoroughly understood by everybody. It also must be practiced by everybody.

I refer to the partnership approach in fish and wildlife. *It is the only way we can do all the jobs which have to be done.* Don't let anybody kid you into thinking any one of us can get along without the other.

First of all, if either your agencies or mine, or the private organizations, were loaded with money and manpower—which we're not—individually we still wouldn't have enough capacity to get all the research and management jobs done in time to escape the fish and wildlife losses we seek to avoid. Even under the best of circumstances for all of us, our only hope is in the closest kind of teamwork which will eliminate waste effort and make our combined contribution as effective and as fast as is humanly possible.

The states are looking to the Federal government for—and they deserve to receive—guidance and coordination for their activities in areas of mutual interest. In research, they would like to know what is being done by whom on fish and wildlife problems that concern them and how they can handle their share of the investigation pattern without duplicating someone else's effort. They also want a central source of information on latest developments in management practices; they seek constructive criticism on new types of programs they develop, and they want to know how they can contribute most effectively to the management of species which are the primary responsibility of the Federal government, but which are also of major interest to them.

It is our intention to establish our activity pattern in the partnership to provide these services—to discharge these responsibilities in a way which will meet the important needs of the states in resource programs for tomorrow.

So that there may be no misinterpretation about the effect of the partnership approach, I want to make several points very clear. I do not feel that the development of a conservation team means the Federal government is surrendering responsibilities. Neither can I interpret willingness to cooperate as an

invasion of someone else's so-called rights. I am also absolutely certain that any claim the Fish and Wildlife Service is placing itself in the position of being told what to do by the states when it cooperates with them is utterly ridiculous.

After all, I know the State Fish and Game Departments have the same objectives as the Service. It can't be otherwise. There are no double standards in conservation. I also know that the states have been demonstrating a real desire to work closely with the Service. The Flyway Councils, like the Atlantic Waterfowl Council and the Mississippi Council to which a number of you have made valuable contributions, are an excellent case in point. The development of flyway management plans through these Councils with representatives of the Service and the states sitting down together, pooling knowledge and jointly coming up with guidelines for future action is the only way to operate. It's the only worthwhile approach—the partnership way.

I also know that the Service needs the thinking of the able technicians in the states and private organizations who are working in these specialized fields, and it needs the ability of these agencies to apply practices at the problem level. After all, the state organizations are at the grass roots. Not only do they have the best opportunity to apply remedies, but collectively they have more hands for the job.

This is not a one-way street, however. I've been stressing the Service's responsibilities to meet certain needs of the states. The states also have responsibilities in this partnership. Primarily, it is up to them to keep the program objectives of *all* states—in the case of migratory as well as resident species—always geared to the best interests of the resource rather than temporary local harvesting benefits. On this one, I think there has been a darn good record made in recent years. The credit for this belongs to the fine professional biologists in the state ranks who have been spark-plugging their part of the drive to promote the cooperative effort generally.

We are developing our partnership programs not on the basis of political boundaries, but from patterns provided by wildlife itself. We must encourage this kind of planning which rises above the limit of local thinking and which meets broader basic needs. Again, I mention the flyway management plan as the good example. In connection with such cooperative programs, we have a joint responsibility to avoid the pitfall of establishing projects which either have not been checked for conformity to flyway plan objectives or which fail to meet that test even though they provide a temporary local benefit. If we are going to get the most from our efforts from now on, we want to make each move count. The only way we can do that is make certain all our projects conform to a pattern for action which has been jointly agreed upon as the right way to meet our future needs. There can be no exceptions.

When we have this kind of broad planning, such as the flyway approach for waterfowl, the Service must have specific national policies to guide field action. There must be uniformity of execution. Regionally, there cannot be six different kinds of performance and have management plans efficiently executed in flyways which extend not only beyond Service regional lines but beyond the boundaries of our country. Although, under treaty enactments, responsibility for migratory bird management rests with Federal government, I again think these policies should be developed in consultation with our neighbors in North America and with the State Fish and Game Departments and the private conservation agencies which have direct interest and whose activities in connection with the flyway program also will be affected.

Our partnership goes beyond the team effort in planning and in action. We must also talk the same language so that there can be resource-minded public understanding rather than conservation confusion. Only with that understanding will there be public support for our program. Only with that support will we get the appropriations and authorizations needed to carry them out.

In these discussions, I have used only the example of waterfowl planning as an area for cooperative effort. The need applies equally to other programs in which the states and private agencies and the Federal government have interests. It must be met in all cases. I leave you with a conviction and a promise:

1. There can be adequate fish and wildlife conservation progress only if we have complete cooperation.

2. It will be the policy of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to constantly promote the conservation partnership approach.

Now, let's get going!

## OBSERVATIONS ON THE NEED FOR AND THE IMPORTANCE OF ARTIFICIAL IMPOUNDMENTS IN THE SOUTHEASTERN STATES

*By* A. H. WIEBE (Retired)
*Tennessee Valley Authority*
Norris, Tennessee

I propose to talk about artificial impoundments. I trust that my experience is sufficient to warrant this action and yet not so complete as to make me an expert on the subject and, hence, doctrinaire in my viewpoint regardless of what facts I may or may not have in my possession.

For a long time those impoundments built for the usual statutory purposes (navigation, flood control, power, and/or national defense) were suspect insofar as fish and wildlife were concerned. This attitude resulted from (1) inadequate land acquisition for public access and feeding areas for ducks and geese; (2) reservoirs were usually single developments and, hence, fluctuations in water level were frequently severe and rarely followed a schedule; (3) the fish populations were not adequately investigated to determine their true status—why study something that does not exist; and (4) the closed season during the period of the year when fishing is at its best prevented the accidental discovery that artificial impoundments did support fish life.

Permit me to state here and now that reservoirs built for navigation, flood control, power, and national defense can, under certain circumstances, make a major contribution toward satisfying the demands of the anglers and the gunners as well as the need for general recreation, although these matters were not given too much attention in the design and work plan of the project A hydro-electric or flood control, etc., project need not necessarily be incompatible with the wildlife interests—and this may be true even in a region where the breeding of the malaria mosquito must be controlled. In fact, if I were inclined to do so, and I am, I could state categorically that in the Tennessee Valley a series of some 26 dams built for navigation, flood control, power, and/or national defense has provided as many acres of superior fishing water and waterfowl habitat—feeding areas as well as swimming pools—as have been provided by the agencies whose specialty it is to accommodate the needs of the fishing and hunting public.

The important point to consider is that people on both sides of the fence must act rationally, give and take, for it cannot be the whole hog in either direction. The engineer and the wildlifer must understand one another, they must cooperate *sincerely;* they must within reason render mutual assistance one to the other.

It has been my good fortune during some of the controversies over dams and reservoirs on the one hand and fish and wildlife on the other to have a seat on the 50-yard line, or perhaps I should say the goal line—or even worse, there have been times (at least it seemed that way) that both elevens were charging at me. I must confess that I have not always felt proud of the attitude of the engineer (used here to cover all people directly associated with the building and operation of reservoirs) but to be quite honest there have been times when I felt discouraged because of the intolerant attitude of certain so-called conservationists.

The region in which most of us live is not blessed with an abundance of natural lakes. You, of course, understand the principles of geology that account for this fact. I have at times—when the argument of wildlife vs. mosquito control seemed to get out of hand—felt that the absence of lakes in the southeastern states came about because geology anticipated the malaria problem, and was not due to the absence of certain natural depressions, or erosion, volcanic and tectonic forces.