

Game and Fish Commissioners in Tulsa, Oklahoma. Plans for introductions of three species of tinamous from Argentina into Southeastern habitats were discussed. Plans for the 1966 annual meeting, tentatively scheduled for Missouri, were also formulated.

Respectfully submitted,
The Southeastern Foreign Game Committee

ROBERT E. MURRY
JAMES E. KEELER
DENNIS HART
GLENN D. CHAMBERS
JOE W. HARDY
GEORGE B. WINT
FERD SUMRELL
DR. GARDINER BUMP
LEE K. NELSON, *Chairman*

WILDLIFE SOCIETY, SOUTHEASTERN SECTION
PUBLICATION AWARDS COMMITTEE REPORT
October, 1965

The members of the committee were the same as last year: Dale H. Arner, A. Sydney Johnson, James C. Lewis, and the Committee Chairman.

In our opinion, the best paper which was not in the Proceedings, written by a member of the Section during the past two years, is "Effects of heptachlor-contaminated earthworms on woodcocks" by William H. Stickel, Don W. Hayne, and Lucille F. Stickel. Selected as the best paper presented at the previous Technical Sessions (18th Annual Conference) is "A simple technique for removing mandibles of deer without trophy defacement" by Charles M. Marshall, James F. Smith, and A. J. Weber.

The committee was not able to select a winner for the best paper presented at the 17th Annual Conference because copies of all the papers were not obtained. If the proceedings of the conference are published, the papers can be judged then.

Several publications *edited* by Section members and otherwise apparently eligible for an award came out during the past year. Although some of these are fine work, we did not consider that editorship is authorship in the sense of the Section awards. This might require clarification.

The committee has prepared a revised version of the rules governing the Publication Awards Committee which we believe will simplify the work of the committee. The new rules which follow embody most of the suggestions made by the committee at the business meeting last year. Enough copies are available for those present, I believe. We recommend that they be incorporated into the by-laws of the Section or sanctioned officially in some other way. In any event, we suggest that these rules replace the current "Method of Selection, Criteria, and Eligibility for Annual Publications Awards by the Southeastern Section of the Wildlife Society (As amended October 1959, Baltimore, Maryland)." A copy of these rules is attached to the proposed revision. A comparison will reveal that most of the later rules are incorporated into the proposed revision.

I want to thank the members of the committee for their deliberations and assistance. It has been reassuring that we have all agreed so closely on the selection of winning papers and on other committee business. It has been a valuable experience and a pleasure for me to serve on the committee.

Respectfully submitted,
LOVETT E. WILLIAMS, JR.
Chairman

SUMMARY OF FARM GAME COMMITTEE REPORT WITH
REGARD TO "FEE HUNTING" AS PRESENTED
TO THE SOUTHEASTERN SECTION OF THE
WILDLIFE SOCIETY MEETING
TULSA, OKLAHOMA
OCTOBER 13, 1965

Several years ago the Farm Game Committee recognized that "landowner incentive" was the only means through which much of the posted lands could be made available for public shooting of most farm game species. This same "incentive" is an absolute necessity if we are ever to induce the farmer to practice game management of his land. A suggestion was made that several states attempt to conduct field tests whereby a group of farmers or landowners would pool their land and sell hunting permits. (Farm Game Committee Report, 1963). It was believed this proposed pilot project would evaluate fee hunting under actual field conditions and that we would not have the necessary data to judge whether fee hunting would be successful or advantageous until such pilot projects were completed and evaluated. These suggestions were received favorably by the directors at their spring meeting in Atlanta as being a "good positive approach" toward reducing the amount of land then posted against hunting.

Needless to say, no field trial of this nature was conducted. In a few states where attempts were made, the landowners needed and demanded some assurance that such endeavors would be a sure source of income and not another problem area. Other states reported that they did not have the time, finances, or personnel to initiate such tests.

That the sportsmen will pay for hunting or shooting rights is more evident now than three years ago. Public shooting clubs are flourishing. Individual hunters are willingly paying for dove shooting, waterfowl shooting and deer hunting privileges. Other individuals or groups of individuals are renting the entire hunting rights of large tracts of land. It is with the latter situation that the committee members are worried as the hunting rights are often leased by a few individuals for the purpose of hunting only one species of game. This we do not advocate as it does not provide the greatest amount of hunting possible on these posted lands.

The Farm Game Committee, after some discussion on October 11, 1965, feels that we need research data which can be used to show landowners the advantage (or disadvantage as the case might be) of opening up their lands for hunting on a fee basis. It is believed that research data should provide answers to such questions as:

What size area is needed?

How many hunters can be permitted on a square mile basis for each farm game species?

Should fees be based on daily or seasonal rights?

Should rights be limited to one species at a time?

What fee must be charged to insure income to the landowner?

How can income from hunting (and/or fishing in farm ponds) on lands of several owners be adequately disbursed among the owners?

Is fee hunting good, bad, or otherwise?

These and other questions need answering before the landowner can realize the value of his farm game.

Thus the present committee, feeling that "landowner incentive" is the most pressing need toward increasing farm game hunting, makes the following recommendations to the incoming President:

1. That the incoming President review reports of the Farm Game Committee for the past 5-7 years so as to become familiar with the thoughts of previous committee members.

2. That the incoming President give some consideration to the selection of Farm Game Committee members that are associated with universities or colleges that have wildlife curricula and research facilities, and who could initiate a study to determine the means, methods, and probable income from fee hunting of all farm game on private lands.

Pete Farrar
Jack Crockford
Lloyd G. Webb
Edward G. Sullivan, Chairman
Lee Nelson, Acting Chairman at 1965 Meeting

FARM GAME COMMITTEE REPORT*

In March 1965 the Farm Game Committee of the Southeastern Section of the Wildlife Society adopted a Resolution calling for action by the President of the United States through the Secretary of the Interior to set aside a major portion of the 36-000-acre Camp Breckinridge Military Reservation in Kentucky as a hunting area to be administered by appropriate Federal or State agencies. Concern for decreasing hunter opportunity and the recognition that farm game habitat on privately owned tracts is being destroyed at an alarming rate resulting in declining wildlife populations—prompted this action. Copies were distributed to the Secretary of the Interior, Members of Congress from the Commonwealth of Kentucky, the Governor of Kentucky, the Southeastern Association of Game and Fish Commissioners, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, the Kentucky Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources, the League of Kentucky Sportsmen, the Wildlife Society, and the Southeastern Section of the Wildlife Society.

The General Services Administration on September 30 of this year disposed of an initial 3,932 acres in farm-size parcels at public auction. As of now, it looks like only a very small portion of the area, if any, will remain in public ownership for hunting purposes. Although this Resolution has had little or no effect, it represents positive action by this Committee concerning the problem of farm game hunting opportunity. Support from local newspaper and radio media, outdoor writers, and interested individuals was heartening, but unfortunately not strong enough to withstand the massive political and governmental forces bent on returning additional tracts of land to crop production, many already in surplus.

* Presented at the meeting of the Southeastern Section of the Wildlife Society in Tulsa, Oklahoma on October 13, 1965.