Now my applying the title of "professional men" to us lawmen may seem a bit strange, however, Noah Webster who wrote the Dictionary did not think so. The word professional man is not relegated to the doctor, or the lawyer, or the clergyman. It is in essence applied to a man, other than a tradesman, who dedicates his life's efforts toward a cause of undertaking. Certainly we are devoted to the cause of conservation and are therefore following a profession and should command the respect and dignity accorded a professional man. We must be counsellors. Teach the inexperienced, check the greedy, inform the ignorant and protect the foolish. Conservation enforcement is an honorable profession to be practiced by honorable and responsible men and women. Those who do not qualify and fail to live up to the highest standards run the risk of being deprived of the privilege of being regarded as professional men.

VALUE OF THE HANDBOOK TO CONSERVATION OFFICERS IN THE SOUTHEAST

By D. WARREN LUPTON
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife
Atlanta, Georgia *

Mr. Chairman, Fellow Law Enforcement Officers and Guests:

Regardless of whether or not enforcement personnel may have had the advantage of special training in the field of game and fish law enforcement, the handbook, or manual, or still better the instructions for the guidance of all game and fish law enforcement officers, whether State or Federal, continues to be a most important tool of the enforcement officer. Why is it such an important tool? The answer is simple. The Congress and the Legislatures are continually changing laws and regulations governing means and methods of taking wildlife. Each change in a law or regulation usually necessitates a new interpretation, a different enforcement technique, etc. In addition, agricultural practices have changed considerably during the past decade. I mean, gentlemen, things have really changed since you and I were assigned our first badge and gun. It may be that when we first started to work in this profession that we had a supervisor who, if he was sincerely interested in wildlife conservation, would spend a few hours each month sympathizing with an acute problem which we might have, or giving us one man's opinion on a particular technique or method of enforcement. He was the boss so it had to be done in accordance with his thinking. Now, gentlemen, please don't feel that I am being critical of supervision; quite to the contrary, I am fully cognizant of the great need for supervision. What I am trying to point out is that the opinions contained in the handbook, or manual, came about in most instances as a result of long-time experience by a group of experts frequently coordinated with technical aspects indoctrinated by a group of men of a particular profession. No one can deny that game and fish law enforcement is a profession, and I, as a member, am quite proud of my profession. We know that some progress has been made in some of the States toward the compilation of a handbook for enforcement personnel. I do not know how many states in the Southeast have adopted the use of such an official handbook.

I am familiar with certain material prepared by the Institute of Government, University of North Carolina, on the "Law of Arrest" and the "Law of Search and Seizure" which are two very important subjects in the enforcement field. I am sure that most of you must be aware of the book on wildlife law enforcement by Mr. William F. Sigler, Professor of Wildlife Management, Utah Agricultural College. This book contains a wealth of knowledge but still leaves quite a bit to be desired in the way of a guide for game and fish law enforcement officers. Worthy of mentioning, also, is the field manual prepared by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service as a guide for United States game management agents. This manual is generally referred to as the agents' Bible.

* This paper was presented by Mr. F. C. Gillett in Mr. Lupton's absence.

Being more familiar with this manual than I am any other, naturally I expect to dwell somewhat on its contents.

The manual in its present form has become somewhat obsolete, and is presently undergoing a revision. It certainly has been a godsend for the game management agents. By no means do I intend to set this manual up as the perfect model guide for your enforcement personnel, but I do feel that a similar handbook or manual might lend valuable assistance to those of you who may be interested in adopting or compiling some type of manual or guide for your enforcement personnel. Briefly, let's take a look inside this manual and see what it consists of.

First of all, the number one problem of all Federal enforcement personnel, as well as many of the State personnel, is the baiting regulation. In order to enforce baiting regulations effectively, any officer must know what to look for, how to find what he is looking for, and what to do about it after he finds it. We have a section in the manual which gives various techniques in dealing with baiting. These techniques include (1) air observations for signs of baiting, (2) ground observations for bait and (3) describes a bait scoop which has been used quite advantageously in the big waters along the Atlantic Coast. It even gives a specification sample of a basket bait scoop. This manual dwells considerably on the proficiency and efficiency of the game management agent. It outlines the general duties and activities of the law enforcement officers, instructs the agents relative to personal conduct and political activities, advises them regarding the preparation of various types of reports, outlines procedures in the issuance of U. S. Deputy Game Warden commissions. Of the utmost importance are the various acts which the agent is charged with enforcing, such as the Migatory Bird Treaty Act, the Migratory Bird Conservation Act, The Bald Eagle Act, The Lacey Act, The Black Bass Act, etc. It outlines procedures for handling juveniles who may be apprehended in violation of some of the acts, instructs the agents on spite cases, confessions, preparation of affidavits, even gives a specimen affidavit, search of automobiles, and proper procedure for the enforcement of wildlife regulations on military installations. The manual advises the officer what is evidence and what is not evidence, cautions him relative to his preparation for testifying, as well as his personal appearance, outlines policy regarding the issuance of permits to control depredations of migatory game birds, and contains a few extracts from rules of criminal procedure for the district courts. As stated in the outset, this manual is presently undergoing a revision and we are very anxious to obtain copies of the revised edition.

Also, valuable material can be obtained on the following index of subjects:

1. Ethics, Conduct and Development of Professional Ability.
2. Public Relations.
3. Report Preparation and Dictation.
4. Description and Identification.
5. The Use of Small Arms.
6. Fingerprints.
7. Questioned Documents.
8. Photography.
9. Constitutional Law.
10. Conspiracy.
11. Searches and Seizures.
12. Law of Arrest.
13. Statute of Limitations.
14. Rules of Evidence.
15. Court Tactics of Defendants.
16. Criminal Groups.
17. Rules of Criminal Procedure.
18. Preparation of Criminal Court Cases.
19. Conduct in Testifying in Court.
20. Sources of Investigative Information.
21. Surveillance.
22. Incognito Undercover Operations.
23. Informers.

24. Handling of Prisoners.
25. Interviewing and Interrogating.
26. Statements.
27. Effective Speaking.
28. The Collection and Preservation of Physical Evidence.
29. Raids.
30. Investigative Techniques and Procedure.
31. Self Defense.

A great deal of progress has been made in the game law enforcement program in the Southeast. The selection of well qualified personnel, adequate instruction and competent supervision is evident as compared to just a few years ago. This combination enhances the value of enforcement and places it in its rightful position as one of the most important tools of management and conservation of wildlife.

ADDRESS OF DISTRICT ATTORNEY BOYCE HOLLEMAN, SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests and members of the Fourteenth Annual Conference of this Southeastern Association of Game and Fish Commissioners:

I am deeply honored to have the opportunity to participate with you in this conference which is gathered here in the interest of one of the most important parts of the American way of life. It was my privilege as a boy to be reared by a father who loved wild life and who wanted his boy to have a keen appreciation for the place in a man's life reserved for hunting and fishng. Sometimes I am sure my wife feels that perhaps I learned this lesson a little too well! My father was one of the first game wardens in the State of Mississippi and became a game warden in Stone County in 1932, when the State Game and Fish Commission was organized. Those were the days when a game warden had to be well armed. Those were the days when we were beginning for the first time to teach our people of the value of the conservation of wild life. Many times I have gone at night with my dad to the showing of a little movie in some rural community dedicated to awakening the people of that area to the need for conservation of wild life. Hunter Kimball was then the Director of the Mississippi State Game and Fish Commisson and Talmadge Saucier, just a few miles North of here at the rural community of Saucier, was one of those game wardens who came out of the county system to become, along with my dad and many others, the first State game wardens.

Not only from that personal observation of law enforcement as a boy, but from the thrill of following the bird dogs and catching a bream has it been my pleasure to consider it an honor to make a contribution in any way to the furtherance of the conservation of our wild life. So I come today not only honored by your invitation to be here but with a personal feeling that I have come to pay a debt owed for the contribution that you and your predecessors have made to the American way of life. As a father of four boys, all of whom I hope will love to hunt and fish, I would hate to think of the day when there were no more quail, no more bream, no more bass, no more wild turkeys and no more deer. There must always be a balance between the onrush of industrialization with its subsequent pollution and the need to preserve for posterity the pleasures which we have enjoyed, hunting and fishing.

I have been assigned this subject today which, according to the program, has been entitled Procedures, Filing and Handling of Game and Fish Law Violation Cases in Mississippi State Courts. As District Attorney for the last eight years of this district in which you hold your conference I have had occasion to observe something about this subject and to actively participate with my game wardens in this district in the prosecution of these cases. First of all, may I make this point? The process of justice is a cooperative process that requires team work from the man in the field with the badge to the District Attorney who finally handles the case in the court and places it before the court or jury; and when I say District Attorney, of course, I also include the County Prosecuting Attorney. You cannot have a successful administration of justice unless there is a full and complete spirit of cooperation between the hand

that gathers the evidence and the voice that speaks for the State in the court room.

The technical aspects of law violation prosecution are necessarily complicated and often require years to understand in their substance and application. There are pages of opinions written by Judges of the Supreme Courts across our land dealing with some simple technical aspect of an affidavit drawn in the prosecution of a simple misdemeanor. It is necessary, it seems to me, that any officer have certain basic fundamental understanding of the course of justice in order that he might appreciate the need for technicalities.

It is fundamental to the concept of Amercan justice that every man is innocent until proven guilty beyond every reasonable doubt in the case of direct evidence, and beyond every reasonable doubt and to the exclusion of every other reasonable hypothesis than guilt in the case of circumstantial evidence. Thus, the law throws a shield around the innocent and guilty alike and makes no distinction between the two, nor does it distinguish between crimes of any nature, whether a man be charged with hunting without a license or with the most brutal front-page murder. Out of this concept of American justice, and it is the safeguard of all our liberties, has come the development of the many technicalities which sometimes seem to us to delay justice. We must always remember however that no matter how small the criminal charge may be it is still an over-all part of the test of American justice which is only as strong and as just as its weakest link.

I have stressed these generalities because I want you first of all to have a keen appreciation of our system of justice. It is the greatest and the fairest in the history of mankind.

Bearing then these fundamental principles in mind, let us turn specifically to certain fundamentals. Criminal charges are originated in Mississippi by one of two ways. First, by an affidavit filed before an officer authorized to accept a charge. This can either be a Justice of the Peace in the district having jurisdiction of a misdemeanor, a County Judge in the county where a misdemeanor or felony has been committed, or certain other officers in judicial capacities who are not frequently used in the case. Secondly, prosecution may be begun by the indictment of a grand jury which is the exception rather than the rule in the case of misdemeanor. This affidavit becomes the basis of the entire lawsuit between the State of Mississippi and the person charged with crime. It, therefore, must be able to withstand the technical assault which will be made against it, as pointed out a few minutes ago.

It is fundamental that this affidavit be filed in the place where the crime was committed, if there be a judge in that district qualified to receive the charge. If the misdemeanor or game law violation occurred in a district that does not have a Justice of the Peace and there is no county court in that county, then the charge may be filed before a Justice of the Peace of another district in that county. However the affidavit must show that this charge is being made before this Judge because there is no Justice of the Peace in the district where the violation occurred. This is fundamental and an affidavit failing to show this, fails to give the Justice of the Peace jurisdiction of the crime and cannot be corrected on an appeal to the Circuit Court. Thus, we cross the first big technical hurdle contained in the word Jurisdiction. There must be jurisdiction before there can be prosecution.

It is fundamental that the affidavit must charge a crime and it must charge the crime sufficiently to advise the person being charged with the offense and the nature of the charge against him. An affidavit which fails to state a criminal charge, fails again to give jurisdiction to the court below and cannot be amended or corrected on appeal to the Circuit Court. It is, therefore, vitally important to place into the affidavit the essential information relating to the charge which is intended to be placed against the defendant. This. of course, requires that the officer making the charge have some knowledge of the law that it is his duty to enforce. I must pause here to make this observation. Nearly every game warden that I have seen carries this little green book, put out by the Game and Fish Commission, containing a digest of the Mississippi Game and Fish Laws, but many of them fail to realize that these little green books are not kept in the court rooms and that the fundamental law of the land is found in the code to which his book refers by section number. I have seen a look of surprise cross the face of the game warden when you ask him about

the code and, while it is simple to the utmost degree, often times my experience has been that the failure of an officer to properly perform his duty is simply due to the fact that someone failed to make a simple explanation of that duty to him. Every game warden should have explained to him that the condensation of the law he carries simply is a reprint of the Mississippi Code and that this code should be shown to him so that he may properly understand the relationship between the law he carries and its origin by legislative enactment and placement into the code.

Every game warden and law enforcement officer should likewise realize that the County Attorney and District Attorney are available to them to assist them in correctly drawing and filing an affidavit. A few minutes' consultation in person or by telephone with the County Attorney or District Attorney will often times save a great deal of embarrassment to a game warden in the subsequent trial of a case. I have always encouraged the people connected with the Game and Fish Commission in my district to call on me at any time about their problems. Game and fish cases have a way of obtaining more notoriety when contested by some dissident game law violator than do some murder cases. It is vitally important, therefore, that we have this type of team work and relationship which I referred to earlier.

The reason that the law demands so religiously that the affidavit correctly state the nature of the offense charged and its venue, lies also in another fundamental principle of American justice and that is the protection against Double Jeopardy. This is the principle that protects a man from being twice tried for the same offense and it is necessary in affording this protection that the law require that every charge be sufficiently described so as to distinguish it on a subsequent attempt to try him for the same offense.

When the affidavit is filed, a warrant is issued. Of course this warrant should be served even though the arrest was made by the officer, as he has a right to do, when the misdemeanor is being committed in his presence. An officer has no right to make an arrest without a warrant for a misdemeanor except when it is committed in his presence; otherwise he must always have the warrant. It is important that an arrest always be properly made in order that evidence discovered will be admissible against the defendant in a subsequent trial.

It is imperative for the officer to realize that his duty does not end with the filing of the affidavit, and that to arrest every game law violator in the United States tomorrow would do absolutely no good if none of them were tried and brought to justice. The case begins with the discovery of the crime and does not end until the defendant is adjudged guilty or innocent with a final adjudication. I find sometimes that too many officers, and I am speaking of all officers, feel that the case has ended so far as they are concerned when the newspaper stated that John Doe has been arrested and charged. The officer's duty remains the same throughout the case and that is to provide the information and the evidence that caused him to believe that a crime was being committed in the first place when he started the process of justice.

Every person associated with the enforcement of the game and fish laws must always remember that every time a game law violator is brought into the court, anywhere in the land, the entire principle of the right of the State to conserve our wild life goes on trial. There are always those who would like to see the game and fish laws repealed. I suppose that this system of laws has as many enemies as any other particular group of laws under which we live. This, of course, is a hangover from the days when the law violators roamed our land and almost depleted and destroyed our wild life. Thus, it is importnat for the officer to remember that, as a witness in the court room, he speaks not only for the particular case then on trial but he represents the game and fish laws of our State, their enforcement and in the final analysis the right of our State to conserve wild life and enforce laws against this destruction. A good officer must show this quality in the court room as a witness. He should be prepared by knowing his facts, by speaking honestly and truthfully without exaggeration, without prejudice and, finally, with the definite impression that he is an officer doing something for the benefit of the land in which the jury lives.

It is important too that every officer realize that he is not the court and that whatever the decision of the court may be, whether it be that of judge or jury, should be accepted by the officer in a spirit that his duty has been done

with its presentation and the decision must necessarily rest on other responsible parts of our system of justice. Nothing is any worse than to see an officer criticize a court for a decision, for to do so is to destroy the faith of our people in their system of justice.

Aside from these procedures which I have endeavored to discuss in these brief minutes, I would call your attention to section 5866.04 of the Mississippi Code of 1942, which deals with the seizure and confiscation of property used in illegal hunting as contraband. This section gives another powerful weapon to the officer in the enforcement of the law dealing with telephone fishing and head-lighting of deer. In this section, our law declares that any equipment, appliance or conveyance used directly or indirectly in these illegal activities is declared to be contraband property and shall be confiscated and forfeited to the State of Mississippi and shall be seized by any employee of the State Game and Fish Commission or other officer and, further, deprives the person of any property rights in such property. This, of course, means that you can take a man's boat, motor, automobile or any other personal property which is used directly or indirectly in the conduct of these illegal activities. This procedure, of course, is complicated and should only be invoked with the advice and consent of the prosecuting attorneys in that particular section. It is, however, a very formidable weapon in the enforcement of these particular game and fish laws and it has a deterrent effect upon others. A man who loses his automobile or truck because he had a deer being transported after having been illegally killed, is the best example to act as a deterrent to others that can possibly be used in the enforcement of the game and fish law. Sometimes we overlook the full force and impact of the use of this law.

Finally, may I say that in these words I have attempted only to cover generally fundamental problems in the administration of the game and fish law. I hope that out of this you may feel that we in the courts recognize your particular phase of the law as just as important a function of the over-all picture of a society of law as we do any other part. You will always find that the courts are ready, willing and able to help you in your great cause. May we join together in a devotion to the conservation of the wild life in America, for in a land where no turkeys gobble and no quail whistle and no bass jump—in that land we would not want to live.

Thank you gentlemen very much.

ADDRESS OF PERCY V. RICHARDSON, SPECIAL AGENT, FBI

I would like to discuss briefly, the various phases of evidence, the collection, identification and preservation, and its admissibility into a court of law.

If the investigator of Crime is to achieve success he must possess a sound knowledge of the rules of evidence; the ability to recognize it, and proper training to gain its possession for legal entry into court. To determine when the Law of Evidence enters enforcement let us visualize several enforcement steps. The first step is to determine what person is responsible for the crime. This constitutes investigation. The second step is to bring the accused person before the court. This is done by certain legal processes, frequently involving the execution of warrants for arrest or search. The third step involves determination of the position the defendant will take concerning the criminal charge against him. This is partially ascertained at arraignment by his plea to the charge. The fourth step involves the government's attempt to demonstrate its charge against the subject when he pleads not guilty. This is the trial. In the fifth step the guilt or innocence is determined by the verdict of the jury. The sixth step is the execution of the court's judgment in the case.

Obviously, the Law of Evidence mainly enters the enforcement of criminal law in two of its most important stages—investigation and trial. The success of the first governs the outcome of the second of these two stages. The investigative responsibilities of the officer will frequently require many hours in gathering facts. He will interview witnesses, possibly conduct surveillances, collect physical objects for laboratory examination, and consult documentary sources of information.

The investigator is not a seeker of information merely for information sake. He deals in evidence which is the basis of justice. His information may seriously affect life, liberty and property. His evidence must be gathered diligently and completely, but must be within the law. He cannot do or say anything in the course of his investigation or inquiries which will taint the administration of justice. To do so would involve his own and the dignity of the agency by which he is employed.

There is a vast difference between ordinary information which might satisiy the man in the street and that which will stand up in court as evidence. Information which will serve as proof at a trial of the truth of the charge in an indictment.

The enforcement officer must learn to define evidence. In ordinary language the term "evidence" is used to describe anything which tends to make the truth of a disputed matter clear. It may be something that we observe ourselves when we witness an event or some sound we hear or object we see. It may be a document we read. It may be something another person tells us that he has observed. If such information tends to influence our belief concerning the truth of anything we call it "evidence".

In the law evidence is defined as that which makes a fact clear to a judicial tribunal, or which tends to furnish or does furnish proof.

Facts are the subject matter of a trial. The principal question of fact in a criminal case is whether or not the accused person is guilty of the crime with which he is charged. There will be many secondary questions of fact involved. The answers to the secondary questions will lead us to the solution of the primary question in dispute. As a means of proof we present evidence of facts.

There are three major methods of presenting evidence in court to prove a fact. The most common method is through the oral statements of sworn living witnesses who have actual personal knowledge concerning the facts. This evidence is called testimony. The second method is the presentation of facts recorded in writing. This is called documentary evidence. The third method is by actual exhibition to the court of physical objects of evidential value. This is called real or physical evidence. It is the so-called silent, formidable evidence of things.

Evidence is generally thought of as falling into two general categories. Direct evidence and circumstantial evidence. Direct evidence is that which tends to prove the main fact in issue, i.e., the guilt or innocence of the subject in a criminal trial in an immediate way. It establishes fact without the need of inference. It establishes by itself the principal fact in dispute.

The most common example would be an eye witness who testifies to the precise fact in dispute. For example he testifies to the fact that he actually saw the defendant commit the offense with which he is charged. Another example of direct evidence would be a dying declaration. A further example is a confession of guilt by the subject. Such direct evidence may be documentary in character; for example, a written confession.

Circumstantial evidence, defined negatively, may be described as evidence which is not direct in its action. Defined in an affirmative manner, it is that evidence which first establishes a subsidiary fact from which the main fact in issue is then deduced by inference. Thus, from the subsidiary fact that the subject's fingerprints were found at a crime scene, the jury infers he was present there and therefore used his opportunity to commit the crime. An inference is the logical possibility of reasoning to the existence of one fact from its usual connection with another. Juries are entitled to make reasonable deductions from proven facts.

The rules of evidence, speaking practically, is a system followed by the trial judge and slowly developed over the years as a means of assisting in the discovery of the truth. They act as a filter through which the judge removes bad evidence from good. It is the yard stick by which the evidence is measured by the judge to determine its admissibility. The rules grew up as part and parcel of the system of trial by jury. The rules are not perfect by any means, but there is a reason for every rule of evidence.

The exclusionary function of the rules provides that if a particular item of evidence fails to meet standards set by the rules, the judge will not allow it to

be considered by the jury. The first test of facts brought before a jury is whether or not they are relevant to the case. Relevancy arises particularly when circumstantial evidence is involved. If a logical connection between the circumstances is absent the facts will not be considered. The second general test of admissibility is that relevant facts be also material. The third test is that the facts be competent, *i. e.,* they must not possess a dangerous tendency to mislead, or over-influence the jury. In some instances facts which may be logically relevant and material, are excluded because the law fears that more harm than good will result from a knowledge of these facts by the jurors. Any criminal case tried before a jury requires admissible facts sufficient to convince each juror of the subject's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

To briefly outline the investigative functions of an enforcement officer and particularly in an agency which is somewhat specialized, *i. e.,* which has specific or clear cut statutes to enforce, it might be more practical to review some of the basic police functions: Those with which contact is encountered with regularity. For example, an offense is committed which involves a crime scene search. The search must be a thorough one resolved in favor of collecting every object, item or thing of possible relevancy and materiality. Items collected must be identified in such manner as will enable the officer, or officers, discovering them to testify later concerning the identity and location of the items. The preservation of items of evidence will entail the showing of the chain of possession to offset any allegation as to identity or change.

Where preservation of the evidence is a problem appropriate steps must be taken to preserve against decay, to reproduce, or provide such other means as will affect proper portrayal of the evidence in court.

Searches generally will involve legal aspects. The legality of a terrain search of a crime scene is generally met through jurisdictional authority of the officer conducting the investigation. If a search is made of premises or privately owned conveyances, necessitating the issuance of a search warrant, particular attention must be paid to the preparation of the search warrant, and which may be handled through the official prosecutor.

A legal arrest may be followed by a search of the person arrested. A search may be made of premises under the control of the arrested person when the search is made incidental to the legal arrest of a subject.

Searches may be made of a subject's premises not incidental to arrest and without a search warrant by the execution of consent or waiver to search, by the subject or by the person in whose legal custody and control the premises or area is contained.

Interviews, constituting a vast percentage of investigative endeavors will involve the obtaining of oral or written statements from subjects and witnesses. Admissions of guilt may be introduced as evidence in court whether oral or written, provided the admissions are made voluntarily and without undue delay in arraignment of the accused before a Commissioner.

So-called signed statements, or confessions, probably constitute the largest single factor in the successful conclusion of cases handled in Federal court. A confession may be written or oral, or partly oral and partly written, or both. Where written, a confession may be written by hand or by typewriter. It may be made on one occasion or on different occasions.

A written confession may be in narrative form and the fact that it was not written out by the subject himself, but by another person who recorded his admission of guilt does not make it objectionable.

A confession or acknowledgment of guilt has no higher evidentary value when written than an oral one. There is a natural inclination, however, for a jury to regard it as more reliable. A written acknowledgment of guilt does not have to be signed to be admissible when properly supported by competent witnesses.

As a practical matter, however, written confessions or acknowledgments of guilt, should be prepared with the view toward obviating any possible successful attack by the defense. An accepted policy in this regard is to obtain a written and signed confession whenever possible. Further, the form of the statement should follow uniform policy. The date and location should be first shown, and the first paragraph constitute a preamble. The preamble should reflect—and truthfully so—the following:

That the subject made the statement voluntarily having been advised that he did not have to make a statement, that any statement he did make might be used against him in a court of law, and that he was advised of his right to legal counsel prior to making the statement. Too, the preamble should reflect the identity of the person to whom the statement is made and his official capacity.

The body of the statement should incorporate the admissions by the subject excluding any extraneous material and particularly excluding the admission of multiple offenses in one statement.

At the conclusion there should be a paragraph, which may be written by the subject himself, if able to read and write, reflecting he has read the statement consisting of a given number of pages and that it is true and correct to the best of his knowledge. If the subject is unable to read the statement should reflect it had been read to the subject, identifying the person who read it.

If the subject is unable to write he may sign by mark with the statement being appropriately witnessed. Within the statement any strike overs, corrections, additions or deletions should be initialed by the subject. Each page should be initialed as an added safeguard reflecting the subject has seen all pages of the statement.

The rules governing the admissibility of a statement or confession rests on whether or not it was voluntary. Additional precautions are taken as a matter of good policy. The same general rule will govern the handling of documentary evidence such as a signed statement which govern a piece of evidence with regard to identifying it in court or establishing the chain of possession. Confessions alone will not suffice in the preparation of a case for trial but must be supported by corroborating evidence. For example, statutes contain certain elements which must be proven and the elements of an offense should be well known to the investigator. For a Federal Agent to obtain a written and signed statement admitting the theft of an automobile in Dallas and its subseqquent interstate transportation from Dallas to Biloxi, Mississippi, knowing it to be stolen, would be an admission covering each of the elements of that particular offense in so far as the subject's admission is concerned. However, a guilty plea could not be accepted by the court on such a statement until corroboration was obtained verifying the theft of the vehicle in Dallas and its transportation by the subject to Biloxi. It is true that in many instances acceptable corroboration is obtained through circumstantial evidence.

The following individuals were given citations for outstanding activity in the field of wildlife conservation, together with a cash award:

Gordon Esslinger, Alabama
George Hatzakas, Arkansas
Elliott Lott, Florida
William L. Cline, Georgia
Roy Toon, Kentucky
Theodore Bonin, Louisiana
Charles J. Green, Maryland
Edward W. Sloan, Mississippi
Robert E. Evans, North Carolina
R. M. Gifford, South Carolina
E. O. Gammon, Tennessee
Gordon T. Preston, Virginia
U. S. Game Management Agent
Walter E. Price, Virginia

The awards were presented by Mr. Tom Kimball who is Executive Vice-President of the National Wildlife Federation.