

catches for those people who like to fish longer than the opening day. I believe this special area accounts in part for this improvement by getting the continued pressure off. I do not have any documented data on this, and this is merely from observation and talking with fishermen found using these streams.

I want to thank my Chief of Law Enforcement, Mr. John McLaughlin, for giving me the opportunity of bringing to you a report on one of the very important parts of our ever growing program in Virginia, to serve our great sporting public. This is reported to you as I see it from the Enforcement Officers viewpoint. I do believe we have the finest group of people in our Commissioners and each person working for our organization, from the Executive Director, Mr. Chester F. Phelps, right on down the line in all ranks. I would like to say of our Law Enforcement Division, that we are members of a profession of which I am proud to belong. We know the duties of the law enforcement division make it the very nerve center of any Game Commission from the standpoint of revenue and manpower. I feel that in our Law Enforcement Division are found some of the finest men, and through their efforts they play a significant role in our very successful programs on Virginia Special Areas. The sky is the limit when we all work together in a positive way for an end to the betterment of all concerned.

MAXIMUM PROTECTION FOR WILDLIFE THROUGH COOPERATION

*By Jack Taylor — Maryland Wildlife Officer
Willie J. Parker — U. S. Game Management Agent*

We believe the enforcement of game laws is a professional discipline and that we who work in this highly selective field should approach all problems in a professional manner. We do not believe the contribution made to North American conservation by enforcement of the regulations has ever been fully recognized. To gain recognition, we must intensify our efforts to be a completely professional and effective law enforcement group.

It is recognized the history of game law enforcement has been explored, developed, and presented dozens of times to many groups. The base thought evolved from such studies is that enforcement of game laws is necessary but very unpopular with a certain percentage of our people who actively participate in the harvest of game and fish in this country. But, unpopular or not, there has never been a time in the history of our country when effective game law enforcement was as important to the renewable resources of our nation as it is today. The need and importance of effective law enforcement will increase daily due to declining wildlife populations, dwindling habitat, and increased pressure from the hunting public.

We believe the competent way to furnish maximum protection to wildlife resources in a State is through a cooperative understanding between the Game Management Agents and the Law Enforcement Section of the State. We know that the prime prerequisite to such an agreement is the absolute necessity for both agencies to recognize the need for, and the benefits to be derived from such a cooperative effort. Recognizing this, Game Management Agents in Maryland and the Law Enforcement Section of the Maryland Game and Inland Fish Department entered into a cooperative law enforcement agreement in the late summer of 1966. Today, we would like to discuss our cooperative effort with you because we believe it has been good for the resources in this State, as well as mutually beneficial to the respective agencies. To discuss this intelligently, we must retrogress and acquaint you with our exact situation at that time.

First, we had to have a complete understanding that our responsibilities and goals were, for all practical purposes, identical. We then discussed what each agency could contribute toward a joint operation. We discussed all aspects and ramifications of a joint program, including obvious benefits and dangers. We were aware from immediate past history that unless the program was well planned and implemented, it could fail because the type program contemplated would certainly work to the

disadvantage of hunters who were not in sympathy with regulations and chose to hunt outside the law. If the program was to be as effective as anticipated, undoubtedly, certain special interest groups in the State would exert maximum pressure to force a split in the two agencies, thus providing the influential poacher opportunity to get out from under the constant and unrelenting enforcement effort.

We were aware of the necessity for constant communications and resolved to thoroughly investigate every complaint which posed a threat to our program. We envisioned certain personality clashes between Agents and Wildlife Officers, and contemplated minor differences of opinion on law enforcement matters. We further resolved to take each instance of disagreement, lay it out for discussion, and agree on appropriate corrective action. In other words, our problems were recognized and arrangements made to solve them long before they materialized. Problems have come up. Our agencies were attacked by the press and subjected to pressure from powerful groups and individuals. The outlaw hunter element literally screamed its head off. Some differences of opinion and a few personality clashes were experienced, but in every instance we have been able to resist efforts to disrupt our working relationship. A cooperative program has been maintained because, from the beginning, there has been very careful planning and a complete agreement on methods of settling differences.

It was agreed a united front be presented to the general public. Game Management Agents and Maryland Wildlife Officers were to interpret, explain, and enforce regulations in exactly the same manner with pointed emphasis on enforcement which would incorporate courtesy, fairness, and impartiality.

The most important decision was to share our physical equipment resources. The State permitted Bureau Agents to use its modern high-frequency radio system, and in fact, loaned radios for patrol cars and the airplane until such time as sets could be purchased. Game Management Agents made available to the State a float plan, helicopter, and the entire resources of the Federal Court system. The radios were of utmost importance because this provided constant and close communication at all times. Aircraft were important to the State in law enforcement, surveys, blind disputes, etc. At that time, we listed our resources as follows:

<i>State</i>	<i>Federal</i>
50 Wildlife Officers	5 Game Management Agents
50 Marked Patrol Cars	6 Unmarked Patrol Cars
Modern Hi-Frequency Radio System	6 Mobile Units on Low Frequency
Good State Court System	Good Federal Court System
Good State Prosecutors	Good Federal Prosecutors
No Aerial Equipment	Super Cub on Floats and Helicopter
Adequate Floating Equipment	Specialized Floating Equipment
No Federal Enforcement Authority	No State Enforcement Authority

Agents requested and received State enforcement authority. Wildlife Officers in key areas and along most State lines were issued U. S. Deputy Game Warden Commissions. This is what we had to work with. Now, let us discuss mutual responsibilities.

Maryland is a small State in area compared to most, but it is unsurpassed in concentrated activity involving the hunting of migratory waterfowl, game birds, and animals. It winters upwards of one-half million Canada geese that, for all practical purposes, are concentrated in five eastern shore counties. In fact, kill of this species annually is rapidly approaching 100,000 birds. This is the largest State kill of Canada geese in the entire nation. In normal years, it winters one-half million wild ducks. Some of the ducks and all the geese are scattered over the vast and complex Chesapeake Bay area and its tributaries. Such wide distribution complicates an already complex problem. Blend this with 25,000 resident and thousands of nonresident hunters, a tremendous commercial hunting interest, and certainly this constitutes ingredients for potential controversy. Maryland has a tremendous herd of whitetail deer over the entire State, with particularly heavy concentrations in

southern and western areas and on the eastern shore. Spot lighting or night hunting is a problem of major proportion. In addition, there are generous populations of dove, quail, pheasant, grouse, rail, rabbit, and others. The fact that all Maryland counties, except four, border other States poses a problem. The resources to be protected have been identified; *how* is protecting them accomplished?

An intensive public relations program has been blended with a vigorous enforcement effort. By taking full advantage of television, radio, newspapers, and through public appearances before sportsmen's clubs, civic clubs, garden clubs, and any other interested groups, we began to tell our story. This entire effort was designed to acquaint the general public, not just the hunter with:

1. The actual value of fish and wildlife resources;
2. The absolute necessity for protecting these resources and the need for regulatory controls;
3. The benefits of voluntary compliance with hunting regulations.

Most public relations programs were joint endeavors. This served notice of our combined, determined effort to protect the wildlife resources of this State by firm enforcement of the regulations. Most courts, both State and Federal, were made aware of our efforts to educate the hunting public; and through this, we now enjoy outstanding support in the courts. This generated considerable support from the general public and from a significant segment of hunters.

An intensified law enforcement program was initiated in September of 1966 with the opening of the mourning dove season. Throughout the season of 1966-67, we maintained relentless surveillance on those who chose to ignore the regulations. Arrest records went up and the courts began to render meaningful verdicts. Federal courts began to place serious offenders on probation for a period of 1 year, with the condition that defendants could not hunt any migratory game birds during this time. In other words, we finally got the attention of the hunting public. We agreed to take full advantage of both court systems. First offenders would be tried in State court, and offenders with prior records and aggravated offenses would be tried in Federal court. Further, it was agreed that if a State officer became involved in a touchy situation in absence of a Federal Agent, the U. S. Attorney's office and the Federal court would be made available for his assistance. Convictions in the 1966-67 season soared to 95 percent. In the hunting season of 1967-68, activity was concentrated on the destructive violator. Many aggravated, over-limit cases were made. Several large, private clubs and some commercial hunting operations were detected in violations. The number of cases increased and their quality improved.

Considerable public support for our program is now evident. If we are able to maintain the enforcement influence generated the past 2 years, the time is nearing when the illegal kill of game in this State will be much less significant than in the past.

Several instances detrimental to wildlife and which were remedied by cooperative law enforcement are worthy of special note. Smith Island is a large, inhabited area in the lower reaches of Chesapeake Bay. It is split by the Maryland-Virginia State line. Here in the past, ducks suffered a terrible toll from traps, closed-season shooting, and night hunting. Combined efforts of Maryland Wildlife Officers, Virginia Game Wardens, and U. S. Game Management Agents have almost eliminated this problem. Use of a helicopter, boats designed to operate in shallow water, and blown-up aerial photographs taken from high altitudes to locate traps, has about law-enforced this element out of existence.

Blackwater National Wildlife Refuge and the area around it had a tremendous problem with deer jack-lighting. One Maryland Wildlife Officer and one U. S. Game Management Agent have made more than 50 such cases in the last 2 years and are rapidly bringing this situation under control. In all other aspects of our Federal-State protection program, reciprocation of efforts and mutual involvement in administration of respective regulations is commonplace. Commercial hunting interests in southern Maryland and on the eastern shore now toe the line because of our cooperative enforcement efforts.

Cooperative surveys, banding, and depredations control have produced excellent results. Waterfowl banding in the winter of 1967-68 will attest the advantage of combined agency efforts. Cooperatively, in excess of 11,000 ducks and geese were trapped and banded Maryland furnished the traps, Game Management Agents furnished the corn, and labor was provided by both agencies. A 40' x 20' duck trap has just been completed on Eastern Neck National Wildlife Refuge. The State furnished part of the wire, Agents and Refuge personnel furnished posts and supports, and again, labor was a mutual contribution.

In summary and final analysis, we point to an interesting observation from the past 2 years of experience. Five U. S. Game Management Agents cannot possibly become familiar with this vast and complex area in its entirety. U. S. Game Management Agents depend on the intimate knowledge the Maryland Wildlife Officer has of his assigned area and of hunters' habits. Maryland Wildlife Officers depend on the specialized equipment of the Agents and the tremendous deterrent of a very interested Federal court.

The logical question now might be: "Is one agency being 'used' by the other?" The answer is, "Yes." Each agency uses the other; however, we believe neither agency is abused. We know cooperation is a two-way street that must be walked by all who participate.

In closing, we believe there is a wonderful opportunity in this State to make a significant contribution to North American conservation by jointly affording maximum protection, commensurate with wise use, to the valuable resources entrusted to our care.

Thank you.

RECOVERY OF BODIES OF DROWNED PERSONS

By Lt. Cdr. Howard Shenton
Maryland Department of Chesapeake Bay Affairs

Rapid recovery of drowned persons is of vital importance to the estate and heirs of the deceased and to the local law authorities. Insurance settlements, pensions, business details, contracts and estate problems may be delayed indefinitely pending the recovery of the body and the identification of same. Long periods of submersion make identification extremely difficult and add greatly to the problems of establishing the cause of death.

Following is an outline of recommended procedures and practices for use when conducting dragging operations:

A. General

1. Location — determine exact location of accident (submersion) by questioning witnesses.
2. Buoy — buoy or otherwise mark the location of the accident, utilizing best information, and extend search as necessary from that location.
3. Craft — drag from row boats, slow speed outboards or runabouts in preference to larger, heavier and less maneuverable craft.
4. Speed of drag — speeds of 1½ to 3 knots are recommended. The drag must drag the bottom, not skip and plane due to excessive ratio of speed to weight of drag. Speed and weight of drag must be such that the drag line tender can "feel". Hand tend the drag line at all times. Too heavy a drag or excessive speed reduces "feel" and body can be snagged without tender knowing it. When drag snags, the tender should pay out line and stop the drag boat; then gently haul in drag for investigation. In average depths of water the drag line should be at least 4 times the depth of water.
5. Body recovered — when body is recovered it is best to tow it to shore, pier or landing and turn it over to the authorities. When weather conditions or distance makes towing impracticable the body may be removed from the water and taken on