

22. What are your recommendations regarding resolution of problems and conflicts of interest?

Comments: Before and after development studies (research); participation in planning in early phases of studies; adherence to Coordination Act; "Give due consideration to all interest," resolve conflicts on local level; early participation by all agencies; "more authority for Fish and Wildlife Service biologist . . . to negotiate and recommend" (Mississippi); "maintain present working relationships" (Missouri); "determine real damage from theoretical damage"—suggestions from State on reducing damages (S. C.); "State SCS. Committee should have final authority to make the final decision of points of conflicts" (Maryland); One State—no comment. Florida and Missouri expressed satisfaction with present relationships. Virginia wished to continue close working relations.

Comment: Most respondents expressed the desire and need for close working relations with State agencies. In terms of these replies, it appears that many conflicts are resolved when the Game and Fish and SCS agencies participate at the field level. Assignment of State personnel to review all proposals at their inception is a critical need. It also appears that basic changes in systems of evaluation established by law need revision. One approach is to give greater strength to the "Coordination Act." Another is to recognize that some losses can not be "mitigated," and avoid or limit developments to protect fish, wildlife, recreation and traditional values where they are significant. Economics should not be the only criteria for judgments made. In terms of present projects, agricultural interests apparently dominate decisions affecting non-agricultural interests, and uses of public funds. This system needs revision.

Appendix to
Report of Water Use Committee
S. E. Section, Wildlife Society
October, 1964
Clearwater, Florida
Submitted by:
HAROLD E. ALEXANDER
Arkansas Game and Fish Commission
Chairman, W. U. Committee

A REVIEW OF THE FARM GAME COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES FOR THE PAST TEN YEARS, 1954-1964 (Including the 1964 Report)*

EDWARD G. SULLIVAN, *Chairman*

Lloyd G. Webb, Clemson College and South Carolina Wildlife Resources Dept.

Lee K. Nelson, Kentucky Dept. of Fish and Wildlife Resources.

F. H. (Pete) Farrar, National Wildlife Federation (Atmore, Ala.).

Jack A. Crockford, Georgia Game and Fish Commission.

Edward G. Sullivan, Chairman, U. S. Soil Conservation Service (Jackson, Mississippi).

* The Farm Game Committee is a technical committee appointed by the Southeastern Section, The Wildlife Society. This paper is respectfully submitted by the Committee.

*A Review of the Farm Game Committee Activities
for the Past Ten Years, 1954-1964*

One of the thorniest problems facing the game biologist and wildlife administrator today is the effective management of our farm game species on a state or region wide basis. This is ironic because it is generally known how to increase wildlife populations on a given unit of farm land, but to materially raise population levels over large areas of varying ownerships is a different story. There are a number of reasons, the most obvious being that the majority of the land utilized by farm game species is in private ownership. In our American system, this private landowner can manage his land as he sees fit. Agencies dealing with wildlife resources cannot force him to practice wildlife management nor can they force him to allow game to be harvested if he did produce it abundantly. Game agencies have tussled with this problem from the beginning, but it is still with us.

Farm game activities over the past two decades have mainly revolved about habitat restoration in an attempt to get at the root of this problem. This is the fifth major activity receiving emphasis in the short history of wildlife conservation! It was preceded by hunting controls, predator control, refuges, and pen-reared game stocking programs. Each seemed to be a panacea in its day. The pattern has been similar in every case. As these activities were introduced they grew rapidly in popularity and considerable money, time and effort were devoted to each activity in turn. Later research showed that each had a place in game management but neither was the complete answer.

The perplexity of this problem prompted the officers of the Southeastern Section of the Wildlife Society to appoint a technical committee to look into the farm game situation. This Committee was appointed in 1954 by the President of the Southeastern Section. It was called the "Farm Game Research Needs Committee." The first committee consisted of 6 members with Mr. C. Edward Carlson as chairman. This committee has continued to function although the name was changed to "The Farm Game Committee" in 1960. Chairmanship and members have been rotated over the years with experienced farm game biologists from various states and agencies serving.

This committee has put considerable time and effort into studying and assembling data on the subject. They have conducted several surveys through questionnaires to the different game departments in the Southeast and also solicited comments from noted farm game biologists throughout the nation. Each year they have submitted a report to the Southeastern Section at the business meeting summarizing their findings, ideas, opinions and recommendations. In the early years a report to the business meeting was about all that was done. Later, copies of the report were made available to members of the Section. As the committee work progressed, enough copies of the reports were made to mail out to members who did not attend the meeting and to administrators and other interested people in the field. Over 800 copies of the 1963 report were mailed out. In 1960 the committee met in an open forum at the Southeastern meeting where the report was presented and discussed by the people in attendance. This annual meeting has continued to the present. Through the efforts of the committee members, the 1961 Report was included in the proceedings of the Southeastern Association of Game and Fish Commissioners. This is done each year now.

Through continued effort for recognition of some of the farm game problems, permission was granted for the chairman of this committee to present a brief report to the Director's business meeting at the Southeastern Meeting in 1963. This was followed by a report and discussion of the 1963 Committee Report at the Spring Meeting of the Directors in April, 1964. It was moved at that time that the Farm Game Committee be made a part of the Southeastern Association of Game

and Fish Commissioners, that it be recognized as a committee of this association and be requested to present reports at the Spring Business Meeting each year hereafter.

At the last meeting of the Farm Game Committee, July 30 and 31, 1964, the members decided that much of the data, opinions, and recommendations contained in past reports still had enough merit to be re-considered. Some of the first reports never received wide circulation and later ones by now are buried in files collecting dust or forgotten. With this in mind, we decided to run down all past copies of committee reports and attempt to summarize and bring out some of the highlights for further consideration by farm game biologists and administrators. Bear in mind that this represents the work and thinking of members who have been on this committee in past years as well as your present members.

Early Work of the Committee

During the early years, as the title suggests, the Committee was concerned primarily with pointing up gaps in the know-how concerning farm game management and recommending research projects aimed at filling these gaps. This was the hey-day of the farm game restoration program; the mass "pass-out" of food and cover plant materials to farmers. Since Pittman-Robertson funds had become available to State Conservation Departments, the habitat improvement theme had gradually assumed a dominant position in the spotlight. Other programs continued in practice but the attempted betterment of living conditions for wildlife became a large and recognized program in the Southeast.

Each state in the Southeastern Region had an active Federal Aid Program dealing with farm game habitat improvement. Federal aid projects were initiated in Alabama, Arkansas, and Louisiana in 1942, in Georgia in 1944, North Carolina in 1946, Florida and South Carolina in 1947, Kentucky, Mississippi and Virginia in 1948 and Tennessee in 1949.

Through 1951 these states had spent \$1,071,342.62 on farm game habitat restoration programs. A large part of this amount was spent on production and distribution of 71,898,370 *Lespedeza bicolor* plants, 52,145 pounds of *Lespedeza bicolor* seed, 183,288 pounds of *Lespedeza sericea* seed, 2,201,015 multiflora rose plants, and 15,409 pounds of partridge pea seed. (Warvel, 1951).

Despite the publicity given this program and the money and effort being spent at that time, the first Committee sensed that currently used techniques of restoration and management were not getting the job done. Already there had been revelations of importance, and following are a few items they garnered from review of past operations:

1. The panacea is non-existent. Bicolor, for example, cannot be successfully established in all of the Southeast or in all parts of an individual state.
2. Habitat improvement programs have operated on the assumption that there is a widespread scarcity of food and cover. Only in isolated instances have efforts been made to identify needs and rectify deficits on the basis of individual land units.
3. Available trained personnel are too few, their responsibilities too numerous to analyze and prescribe treatment on the individual land unit.
4. Acceptance of the belief that adequate wildlife can be produced on the poorest land and waste areas has restricted our vision.
5. We have tried to fight the tide of nature and of land use intensification instead of flowing with it.
6. We have failed to create INCENTIVE for the farmer to want more game. This, one of the needs earliest recognized by the profession, has virtually gone by default. The committee sees no prospect of

lasting results or a generally successful program until real progress is made on the reward problem. Lack of incentive is the cardinal bottleneck in the farm game production picture.

The theme of this first report was "evaluation" of the present program. They urged that these evaluation studies measure the following components:

1. The impact of getting the habitat improvements in place.
2. The impact of the program on wildlife.
3. The impact of the program on the farmer.
4. The impact of the program on the sportsman.
5. The impact of the program on the game commision.

Specifically they asked, "Does the recommended habitat improvement practice offer tangible benefit to the farmer aside from its wild-life advantage? Does it offer anything in terms of cash income, improved cropping technique, soil conservation of enhancement of capital worth?" History shows, they state, that the farmer's return must be something more concrete than esthetic values or a feeling of warmth for the children of nature.

Reports through the middle and late fifties when the Committee was concerned primarily with research needs followed similar thinking. Studies and evaluations of the present program were stressed during this period. Other specific recommendations presented through these years were:

1. An expanded study of exotic animals and plants, selective breeding and hybridization.
2. A reconsideration of individual farm game species in relation to farming practices.
3. Continued studies on population dynamics, movements and habitats, habitat requirements, effects of weather on population levels and development of adequate and practical census methods for farm game.

They looked at the agricultural programs that were coming into the picture during that period and probed for ways to fit game management into them. Specifically mentioned were studies on the effects of pesticides on farm game, the effects of the ACP program, Soil Bank, PL-566 Watershed program and timber management methods.

As we look back now, we know that research projects and studies on most of these items have been conducted or are underway. This is not to say that all problems have been solved, but progress is being made.

Farm Game Committee Work in the 1960's

The year 1960 marked a milestone in the activities of the Committee. With Mr. Lee Nelson as chairman, and Dr. Lloyd G. Webb and Mr. Charles H. Shaffer as members, they set as their major objective a thorough review and evaluation of the effectiveness of past and present farm game activities in the Southeastern Region, and to formulate recommendations for future farm game activities. They delved into the subject thoroughly and came out with a 15-page factual report giving costs, results, and opinions based on surveys of the literature, questionnaires and personal communications with others in the field. There is no doubt that the data assembled in that report caused the game and fish agencies to take a long hard look at their farm game programs because the pendulum began to swing away from the mass give-away of planting materials to farmers.

This 1960 Report was not printed in the proceedings of the Southeastern Association Meeting. The present Committee feels that there are some facts and figures therein that should be preserved for the

record, so we are including parts of it in this review. From the introduction, these paragraphs seem pertinent to the habitat restoration on private land controversy.

"Several factors influence the farmer's point of view. First, a farmer is a business man and, like his city counterpart, he must make the most of his resources and carefully figure his expenses to realize a profit. Many game management techniques can be fitted to regular farming activities by simple alteration of methods, with little or no cost involved. Others require time and expense and many involve the loss of small amounts of land from saleable production. Some farmers are willing and able to afford game management; others are not.

Secondly, the degree of interest a farmer has in wildlife determines the extent to which he is willing to go into game management. There is practically no other incentive for him. Those with no interest may even engage in practices very detrimental to game populations. Others, mindful of incidents that have caused former-sportsmen relations to deteriorate to an all-time low, are reluctant to instigate practices which will accentuate their fears and problems. The farmers who are willing to carry out good farm game management are all too few. One survey revealed that only 5% of the farmers were interested enough to practice game management.

Until now, hunters have generally enjoyed hunting privileges on private lands without charge. How long this situation will prevail in the future remains a matter of speculation. Deer and waterfowl hunting on private land in some states has already established a precedent for hunting-for-a-fee. Unless some revolutionary new programs are forthcoming regarding farming and hunting, this trend will possibly dominate farm game hunting. Good or bad, the game manager who does not foresee this occurrence is short-sighted indeed. In any case, the future of farm game management will be affected."

Under "Review of Past Farm Game Activities" in the 1960 Report, the following paragraph shows something of the cost of this restoration program:

"During the war years, the habitat restoration program was of minor importance, but in the first post-war years great impetus was given this effort, and for several consecutive years it doubled in size. In the fifties it was running at top speed. Tremendous amounts of time and monies were being poured into the program. Available figures reveal that approximately \$6,000,000.00 has been spent on this activity over the past 20 years in the Southeast alone. However, the true cost of this program is roughly estimated to be two to three times this amount, since it was not possible to tally all expenditures involved. Some were unavailable, while others were hidden by other activities. For the most part, only Federal Aid funds are included in the six million figure. The "true cost" would include administrative expenses, time spent by biologists assigned to and paid by other projects, costs expended by personnel of other branches of conservation agencies such as enforcement, public relations, etc. Cost of planting and maintenance should also be included."

Continuing quotes from the 1960 Report, following are their analyses of statewide habitat restoration program and recommendations for future programs:

"ANALYSIS OF THE STATEWIDE HABITAT RESTORATION PROGRAM"

"Due to the magnitude and the importance attached to the farm game habitat restoration program in the Southeast during

the past 20 years, the Committee felt compelled to analyze the various aspects of it. The Committee's thinking was influenced by noting the results of the program in various states and by reviewing the findings of recent evaluation studies. The following analysis lists the positive and negative points of the program:

Aspects favoring the program:

1. Certain public relations benefits were derived. An attempt was being made to improve farm game habitat and the plantings, where they were established, represented a tangible accomplishment. The personal contacts with landowners, as well as those with personal from state and federal agencies, which resulted from the program were valuable.

2. It attempted to help the farmer improve wildlife habitat and to effect game management on a number of individual farm units.

3. Good plantings increased quail and rabbit populations in special cases, particularly where intensive cropping and heavy grazing occurred, where fall and winter cover was lacking, and where winter food shortages existed.

4. Shrub lespedeza and annual plots were found to be of value as an aid to hunting by concentrating quail.

5. The planting program filled a gap in farm game management during a period when there was an apparent lack of alternative programs to supplant it.

Unfavorable aspects of the program:

1. Excessive cost of the program was too great for the results obtained. In relation to the total habitat, the amount of habitat improved was insignificant. Even in those few specific cases where game populations were increased, the cost of the few extra quail and rabbits was unreasonably high for the farmer and the sportsman to bear.

2. In most cases the planting materials were distributed indiscriminately with little consideration given to needs. The program was largely based on the erroneous assumption that food and/or cover was always the limiting factor in quail production everywhere.

3. The program was based on the false sequence of assumptions that seed and seedlings always produced good plantings, that good plantings always represented increased beneficial food and cover conditions resulting in increased quail and rabbit populations and improved hunting for the sportsman. Too many inherent weaknesses were involved. Too many breaks occurred in this sequence of stages and the expected results were seldom achieved.

4. Acceptance of the program on the part of farmers was very low considering the total number of farmers. Too many farmers lacked the interest and incentive necessary to compensate for the time and effort involved in establishing and maintaining the plantings.

5. For a number of reasons, many of the seedlings did not get planted and a great wastage of materials resulted. In some cases, the farmer may have been too busy with other farm chores at planting time.

6. Improper establishment, maintenance, and management caused many plantings to fail. Regular maintenance was necessary to obtain worthwhile plantings. Vines and woody species competition had to be removed from shrub lespedeza plots at intervals. Poor site selection caused innumerable failures. Drought

hindered establishment in many areas. Continued replanting was often necessary before establishment of a quality growth was attained. Damage by livestock was often a constant threat.

7. A secondary objective was to open more land to hunting by the sportsmen who were financing most of the program. No appreciable effects along this line were noted.

8. Expected long-term benefits of the plantings failed to materialize. In some states that had large-scale programs until recently, it is now difficult to find good plantings that are benefiting wildlife.

9. Insufficient personnel were available to supervise properly the planning, establishment, and maintenance essential to the program. Costs prohibited the hiring of adequate personnel.

10. It is believed that money spent on this type of habitat restoration could better be spent on other programs which would benefit a greater number of sportsmen."

In 1962 the Committee sent questionnaires to all state game departments to again summarize the status of planting material distribution. Ten of the eleven states replying distributed some type of material but the trend was more toward seed than plants. The list of materials then being distributed included shrub lespedeza plants and seed, seed and seed mixtures of cowpeas, millet, partridge peas, common and Kobe lespedeza, sericea, grasses, and clovers. Several states had started charging for this material. One state reported little demand when a charge was made, while others reported better utilization when the landowner paid for materials. To the Question, "IS supplying plant materials money well spent in a farm game program?", the majority of answers were "no". Some felt it was good public relations; others thought it had educational value. The states which charged for the material reported better field plantings than when the material was free.

By 1961, the Committee began to get away from emphasis and evaluations of the habitat restoration program on private lands. This was partly due to less emphasis being placed on this by the game agencies. The creation of hunting opportunity took the forefront in this report. By this time most of the states had begun a program of buying or leasing land for public hunting of farm game species.

The outright purchase of tracts of land by state game departments to supplement the hunting opportunity provided by private lands was advanced. It was recommended that cheaper land be purchased in order to spread the acquisition dollar further. Once acquired, economical methods of retarding plant succession needed to be found. A share cropping system on these areas was recommended as one method of holding maintenance costs down.

Leasing of hunting privileges on private lands by state game agencies was another method proposed. This was already in use by a few states at that time. Pennsylvania was cited as an example of a successful program of this type. They had made available to free public hunting over one million acres of private land through lease agreements.

On programs for private lands there exists a great potential for wildlife benefits resulting from agricultural agencies such as the Soil Conservation Service, County Extension Services, and Vocational Agriculture Service. The same is true with federal farm assistance programs such as the Agriculture Conservation Program, PL-566 Watershed Projects, and others. These opportunities were pointed out in the 1961 Report. Damage to certain types of wildlife habitat by some of these programs was recognized.

The 1962 Committee dealt with these agricultural programs and their possible effects on the farm game resources at length. The plea was for a closer cooperation and coordination of programs between agricultural agencies and the game and fish agencies. Cooperative studies and meetings were suggested. The feeling of the Committee on

this subject is expressed in the following paragraph taken from the 1962 Report:

Coordination and Cooperation Between Agencies

“There is no room in modern game management for petty jealousies among agencies on who will get the glory for a job done. Maintaining a supply of game on public lands and getting some form of game management practiced on private land is hard enough at best. This committee believes that all agency heads and field personnel involved in wildlife resource management should look first at the job to be done. How can it best be accomplished? What part can each agency play? Can it be done better by close cooperation of several agencies? Can the agricultural agencies and the game agencies work closer together to do the job on private lands? A better farm game program should come about through closer cooperation between all agencies involved in the various phases of land use and wildlife resource management.”

Lack of incentive on the part of the landowner to practice game management is mentioned in every committee report. Probing for some incentive it was inevitable that fee hunting would enter the picture. That subject broke the ice in the 1961 Report by suggesting, even though this is a controversial subject, that the time was right for bringing it up for discussion. The pros and cons of fee hunting on a daily or per hunt basis versus leases on a yearly basis by groups or clubs were pointed out.

The 1962 Committee explored still further the matter of compensating the landowner for hunting privileges. The rapid increase in the Southeast of leasing arrangements by private groups and clubs prompted this action. In data collected that year, all states but one reported that this practice was on the increase. Extensive leasing of better hunting areas was noted. One state estimated that there was already three million acres under lease by private groups.

This, of course, is a method of compensating the landowner and it strikes at the incentive motive which has blocked farm game programs in the past. But this system leaves several things to be desired in a farm game program. Some of the disadvantages of lease programs were pointed out as the following paragraph from the 1962 Report shows:

“(1) The best hunting areas are generally sought out by these clubs. Once leased to a club, the general public is excluded. This tends to reduce hunter opportunity and, in turn, reduces revenue from license sales and Federal Aid money. (2) There is far more danger of creating a caste system from this type of fee hunting. Some groups are able to pay exorbitant prices for a lease. Other groups have been able to lease large acreages for far less than it was worth. Charging for the right to hunt on a daily basis would eliminate this danger. (3) One of the alarming disadvantages of this type of activity is that many of these clubs hunt only one species of game. For instance, some groups lease large acreages for quail hunting alone. No other hunting is allowed. Other species of game remain unharvested. This is a waste of a valuable resource, while other hunters who might harvest this game are putting away their guns because there is no place to hunt. Should we advise landowners of the multiple species hunting possible on his land?”

A better system of compensating the landowner, the Committee felt, was a system of paying by the day or hunt and giving anyone the opportunity if he was willing to pay. The 1962 Report presented this proposal as follows:

“Paid Hunting on a Per Day or Per Hunt Basis. Paying landowners for hunting privileges on a per day or per hunt basis has long been a live issue among game managers. Such a system has

some real advantages—and some disadvantages. It seems just and reasonable for a landowner to receive some compensations if he spends money and effort to produce game. Can we continue to ask him to put forth this effort as a public service? It was pointed out in last year's committee report that farm game productivity on private lands is generally far below potential and is likely to remain so. Lack of incentive on the part of the landowner to practice game management was pointed out as a major factor. Paying the landowner for the right to hunt may be the needed incentive; at least, this was the opinion of several who expressed themselves on the subject in the questionnaire.

There are a number of advantages to this approach. Some of these are: (1) it might open some of the land now posted against hunting; (2) it might provide the needed incentive for practicing game management; (3) it might increase hunter opportunity; (4) it might create better farmer-sportsman relations; and (5) where all species of game are put on a daily hunting basis, it might provide more efficient harvest of game than on areas leased primarily to hunt one species. Disadvantages are: (1) charging hunters for the right to harvest game goes against the American hunting tradition; (2) it might create a class or "caste" system in hunting; (3) it might eliminate hunter opportunity for a certain element of the population; (4) it might lead to more extensive leasing of land for hunting by clubs and other private groups; and (5) it might harm farmer-sportsman relations."

Regardless of the pro's and con's of fee hunting, the fact remains that few forms of recreation come free anymore. The question we must ask is: Are we to expect hunting as a form of recreation to remain free while we readily pay to play golf, to bowl, or watch spectator sports?

By the time the 1963 Farm Game Committee assembled in Montgomery, Alabama, in August, new topics for discussion and recommendations were hard to come by. One way out was to shake the dust from some of the old problems that had been thoroughly aired in past years but this idea was voted down. After a full day of head scratching, the Committee made the decision to pick up the idea which the prior two reports had been leading up to and carry it through as the *one* subject for consideration. This theme was "compensating the landowner for producing game on his land and allowing the sportsman to harvest it."

The fact was accepted that the farmer must be paid if he is to practice game management. Someone must assume the responsibility for paying him. Game departments can no longer shoulder the burden alone by providing public hunting areas for everyone. This leaves the sportsman responsible. And there is evidence that he is willing to assume this responsibility. But both he and the farmer need the direction and cooperation of agencies in the game management field. With this premise as justification, the Farm Game Committee of 1963 felt that they could no longer make recommendations, write reports, and sit back and wait for something to happen. Time for positive action had arrived. Whether we believed that fee hunting would solve our problem or not was beside the point... it was already upon us. Was there any alternative but to take hold of it and attempt to channel it in a direction that would provide hunting opportunity for the average sportsman rather than allowing it to drift into a system of private leases that would provide hunting for a select few.

The following recommendation or proposal was made to the commissioners, administrators, project leaders and farm game biologists of the Southeastern Region. It was not intended that the state game and fish agencies get involved with directing or promoting a fee hunting system. It was intended as a test project to study the system and gather factual data that could be used to guide landowners and sportsmen. It is possible to classify this as a research project and there is a

chance that Pittman-Robinson funds could be approved to help finance such a study. This is the proposal as given in the 1963 Report:

- “1. Initiate a pilot project in each state to work with selected farmers on a fee hunting system. The project will be operated for profit by the landowners involved. Make this a test study that will give the profession much needed information on this subject.
2. Let the farm game biologist or project leader select the area in cooperation with any other agency that can lend a hand. People who can help are: county agents, vocational agriculture teachers, Soil Conservation Service personnel, and county game wardens.
3. The area may consist of one farm, a group of farms or even a community wide project.
4. Local community development clubs may be a good starting point. The county agricultural workers are familiar with these local clubs in each county. They can offer invaluable assistance and leadership in such a project if they are sold on the idea.
5. When areas have been selected and agreements reached, the game biologists must make adequate plans for a farm game program. Plans should include provision for all species of game adapted—doves, quail, rabbits, squirrels, and even fishing—for a well rounded program. Planning should include cover, food, method of harvest, fee to charge, and division of fees if several landowners are involved. Provision might be made to furnish appropriate planting materials for this trial project. Liability insurance for the owners will be necessary.
6. The area should be appropriately marked and publicized.
7. The farmers involved should understand that this project is not intended to replace their cash crops or bring in large sums of money. It would be designed as a supplement to their farming operation.
8. The project should be planned to answer specific questions on the attitude of the landowner and sportsman, fee to charge, and many other unforeseen problems that will arise.
9. The game department’s financial participation is not suggested to be of a permanent nature. It is anticipated that such projects, if proven successful, would be perpetuated by landowners either individually or collectively. Technical assistance and guidance to these operators should continue to be provided, but the agencies involved should never lose sight of the fact that these are landowner owned and operated projects.”

The 1964 Committee

The 1964 Committee met in late July as has been the practice for several years. It becomes progressively more difficult to come up with new ideas, recommendations and projects which might influence farm game populations and opportunity for harvest of what is produced. It becomes harder even to get suggestions and data from questionnaires and other media. Blank minds were in vogue this year.

The present committee urges serious consideration of the proposal set forth in the 1963 Report.

There is a general feeling that fee hunting is a matter that should be solved by the individual hunter or groups of hunters and the landowner. Many of our sportsmen’s organizations are engaged in a lot of useless activities at present such as rearing of quail for release, promoting beauty contests, and barbecues. Perhaps this is a job for sportsmen’s organizations to tackle. But somewhere the game and fish agen-

cies have a responsibility. This may best fit into the information and education section of these agencies.

Tremendous strides are being made by the states in our region in the acquisition of land through lease and purchase for public hunting. To the excuse that this type operation is too expensive, we can only refer to the millions that were spent in past years on pen-raised game, refuges, and planting materials most of which we can't see the results of today. At least money spent for purchase of land gives a tangible product. If we project our thinking into the future, this trend seems encouraging.

The trend toward cooperative efforts to open other federal lands such as military reservations to public hunting is encouraging. We urge the wildlife organizations and agencies to continue this effort.

We urge, above all, an entirely truthful and straight-forward attitude toward the farm game program by the agencies involved. An effort should be made to clearly state the problems and efforts being made to solve them and try to get the public to understand them.

Conclusions

The wildlife profession, we regret to say, has not especially distinguished itself for originality of thought or independence of action. If there is doubt that this statement is true, quoted below is an excerpt from a report presented in December (1930, to the American Game Conference on an American Game Policy. None other than Aldo Leopold was chairman of this committee.

Inducements for Landowners

"Only the landholder can practice management efficiently, because he is the only person who resides on the land and has complete authority over it. All others are absentees. Absentees can provide the essentials: protection, cover, and food, but only with the landholder's co-operation, and at a higher cost.

With rare exceptions, the landholder is not yet practicing management. There are three ways to induce him to do so:

1. Buy him out, and become the landowner.
2. Compensate him directly or indirectly for producing a game crop and for the privilege of harvesting it.
3. Cede him the title to the game, so that he will own it and can buy and sell it just as he owns, buys and sells his poultry.

The first way is feasible on cheap lands, but prohibitive elsewhere.

The second is feasible anywhere.

The third way is the English system, and incompatible with American tradition and thought. It is not considered in this report."

The report from which this is quoted may well be one of the most significant and prophetic documents in the history of American Wildlife Management. It should be on the required reading list of wildlife biologists today. The same three solutions which Leopold offered are still applicable and perhaps to the same extent. Most of the other recommendations in that Policy have long since been put into practice. Only the problem of growing farm game and arranging for its orderly harvest remains largely unsolved.

LITERATURE CITED

Committee on Game Policy Report to American Game Conference, Aldo Leopold, Chairman. Trans. 17th Amer. Game Conf. Dec. 1, 2, 1930.

Farm Game Committee Reports to the Southeastern Section, The Wildlife Society.

Carlson, C. Edward, Chairman, 1955
Warvel, Harold E., Chairman, 1956
Hankla, Donald J., Chairman, 1957
Hankla, Donald J., Chairman, 1958
Hankla, Donald J., Chairman, 1959
Nelson, Lee K., Chairman, 1960
Nelson, Lee K., Chairman, 1961
Sullivan, Edward G., Chairman, 1962
Sullivan, Edward G., Chairman, 1963
Sullivan, Edward G., Chairman, 1964

Warvel, Harold E., 1951. The Southeastern Farm Game Habitat Improvement Program. Paper presented at 5th Annual Conference, SE Assoc. Game and Fish Commissioners, 21 p.

ACTIVITIES OF THE FOREIGN GAME COMMITTEE SOUTHEASTERN SECTION OF THE WILDLIFE SOCIETY 1963 - 64

Presented at the Eighteenth Annual Meeting of the
Southeastern Association of Game and Fish Commissioners
October 19-21, 1964 — Clearwater, Florida

By

LEE K. NELSON

Chairman, The Foreign Game Committee

The life span of the Foreign Game Committee of the Southeastern Section of the Wildlife Society has been relatively short but it has been one of considerable activity. Five members* made up the original Committee formed in early 1963 and chaired by the late Herman J. Tuttle. The present Committee is composed of nine members,** including two ex-officio members. The writer was appointed chairman following the untimely death of Mr. Tuttle in January of 1964. Herman's contribution to this Committee was great and his passing was keenly felt by all who knew him.

The availability of exotic game species for introduction into Southeastern habitat through cooperative agreements with the Foreign Game Introduction Project of the U. S. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife gave impetus to the creation of this Committee. Previous to this time, the consideration of exotic species was contained in the provinces of the Farm and Forest Game Committees.

The objectives of the Committee are as follows:

1. To increase the efficiency, coordination, and integration of foreign game research throughout the Southeastern Region, attempting to eliminate as much duplication of effort as possible.

*Original Committee Members: Herman Tuttle, Joe Hardy, Jim Keeler, Robert Murry, and Lee Nelson.

**Present Committee Members: Joe Hardy, George Wint, Dennis Hart, Robert Murry, Jim Keeler, Glenn Chambers, Lee Nelson, Dr. Gardiner Bump (eo), and Ferd Sumrell (eo) (Secretary).