

1. Number of boats and motors sold in 1955,
2. The average size of these boats and horsepower of the motors,
3. Trends of the public to purchase more boating equipment,
4. Trends of the public to purchase larger boats and motors of higher horsepower.

I would also appreciate any statistical data you may have compiled that I have not specifically asked for.

I realize the magnitude of this request, for which I can offer no return other than the knowledge that your organization has contributed vital information that will help show the staggering recreational values of Florida waters. Thus the need for equitable water laws that will help perpetuate this source of recreation.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

JIM COUNSELMAN.

JC/ab

## SUMMARY REPORT—PANEL DISCUSSION ON PROBLEMS OF WATER MANAGEMENT

By TRAVIS S. ROBERT

*U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service*

A panel discussion on Problems of Water Management, conducted (at the Southeastern Association of Game and Fish Commissioners meeting in Little Rock, Arkansas on October 9) followed the presentation of four papers on the same theme. These papers included the following:

1. Water Use and the Future of Fish and Wildlife Conservation—Roy Wood, U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service; Roy Grizell, U. S. Soil Conservation Service; Charles Rawls, Tennessee Game and Fish Commission.
2. Needed: A State Watershed Program—Harold E. Wallace, Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission.
3. Opportunities for Fish and Wildlife Development and Management Programs—Watershed Projects Under Public Law 566—Theodore B. Ford, Louisiana Wild Life and Fisheries Commission.
4. Surface Water Uses—Jim Councilman, Florida Game and Fish Commission.

Three major topics were included in the discussion by the panel members. These included, Wetlands Preservation and Development; Stream Preservation and Surface Water Use.

Each state and agency representative on the panel was asked to briefly discuss the problems of his organization pertaining to the three discussion topics. Wetlands Preservation and Development appeared to have been given greatest consideration by the states represented. This may be attributed in part to the fact that most of the states on the panel are located in the lower Mississippi Valley and have been planning fish and wildlife development needs as part of the congressionally authorized Mississippi River and Tributaries Review.

Stream Preservation has also received consideration by most states represented. This action has included such work as pollution abatement, control of sediment, stream stabilization and dedication of certain stream segments in their natural state.

The serious drought that has gripped the Southland for the past several years has made everyone cognizant of conservation and wise use of water. Many states have already passed some type of water rights legislation and others are studying the problem at the present time. State game and fish commissions represented on the panel had all been active in such studies and the formulation of recommendations pertaining to water rights.

Comments from panel members and discussion from the floor indicated the tremendous interest of all present in meeting the needs of fish and wildlife in development of our river basins and management of our waters. Representatives of such agencies as the Corps of Engineers and Soil Conservation Service made definite contributions to the discussion through suggestions and possible solutions to some of our problems. It was very much in evidence that cooperation of local, state and federal agencies had reached a high level of coordination. The further possibility of fish and wildlife conservation becoming a major purpose of land and water development in the lower Mississippi Valley seems relatively bright. It is the job of fish and game conservationists to provide leadership in this endeavor. The Mississippi River and Tributaries Project Review provides a medium for this program in the lower Mississippi Valley. I am reasonably sure that similar opportunities exist elsewhere in the southeastern United States.

## GENERAL GAME SESSION

### IS A SPRING GOBBLING SEASON BIOLOGICALLY SOUND?

By RALPH H. ALLEN, JR.

*Biologist, Alabama Department of Conservation*

We are all familiar with the history of the wild turkey in the Southeast, of its early abundance followed by a steady decline until the 1930's and its gradual build-up in many areas since that time.

The turkey hunting seasons in the Southeastern States are by no means uniform. Maryland, North Carolina, and Virginia have a fall and winter season; Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Tennessee have a spring season; while Alabama, Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina have both a fall and winter as well as a spring season. Kentucky is the only Southeastern State which does not have a huntable turkey population.

Turkeys of either sex are legal game in Florida, Georgia, Maryland, and Virginia during the fall and winter season; while all spring seasons are confined to the taking of gobblers only. Dogs are allowed in the hunting of turkeys in Georgia, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia during the fall and winter season.

Game and Fish Commissions are faced with a number of problems in selecting a turkey season. Some of these problems are: Should both sexes or only gobblers be made legal game? Should dogs be allowed in the hunting of this game bird? What would be a reasonable daily and seasonal bag limit? How many hunting days should be allowed and at what season of the year—fall and winter, or spring? And finally, is a spring gobbling season biologically sound?

It is the object of this paper to discuss the last of these questions—"Is a Spring Gobbling Season Biologically Sound?"—and from the information at hand, decide if such a season can be justified on a biological basis.

In order to prove whether a spring gobbling season is biologically sound, three facts must be determined. These are: Will such a season retard the turkey population? To what extent will such a season interfere with breeding and nesting turkeys? Does a harvestable surplus or males occur and would a spring season provide an opportunity to harvest most efficiently the desired segment of the population?

I. To determine whether hunting of gobblers in the spring retards the turkey population in the different states, let us examine the population figures as furnished by the different states.

Three states, namely Arkansas, Mississippi, and Alabama, have had a spring gobbling season for a period of 25 years or more. In Arkansas the 1940 turkey