WHO ARE THE PROPHETS?

The term conservation encompasses many divergent philosophies and a myriad of activities regarding the use of resources. It is a term so loosely applied that anyone with an interest in trapping turtles to prospecting for uranium can qualify. As a general proposition, everyone is for conservation just as everyone is against sin, that is, until some principle gets in the way of personal interest or economic gain.

The idea that conservation is the wise management of resources for the benefit of mankind is also meaningless, because there is no universal understanding as to what constitutes benefits.

The short-time personal interest versus the long-time public gain is a constant bone of contention, and brings into focus the eternal question whether the democratic processes will eventually discover the fulcrum upon which to balance a truly sound program of resource management.
Conflicts continually arise as some groups attempt to gain equitable recognition for their proposals, while others definitely seek a priority. The bane of conservation is the prevalent thinking in terms of one facet of economic development, and minority groups with strictly one-track minds.

Some lumber interests maintain that democracy will best be served if the National Forests are turned over to private industry; mining interests lobby for preferential treatment, and to the layman's view are still getting it in spite of recent so-called corrective laws; many stockmen contend that true democracy will never exist until the public domain grazing lands are under their jurisdiction.

In this devil-take-the-hindmost philosophy only lip service is given to the dire need for watershed protection and other public equities. Dollars in the bank are meaningless while soil continues to erode to the sea.

Autonomous bureaucracies, such as the Reclamation Bureau and the Army Engineers, have so entrenched themselves that they now control an empire in resources and influence the spending of billions of dollars all of which come out of the taxpayer's pocket. In other words, the tail wags the dog.

In regard to the big dam projects—just what are the important issues? Whether they are built by the Federal Government, or by private industry? Or whether in the name of the public interest some long-headed, long-range planning is done—first to determine if the projects are necessary and in the national interest; secondly, are they economically sound, and thirdly, to evaluate and minimize the disturbance to and the destruction of other resources which will be involved? Will the destruction of timber, fisheries and wildlife and the drowning of minerals be offset by kilowatt hours and more crops for the taxpayer to subsidize? Is spending public money just a local, homey little item, or is it of national concern?

There is always the ever-present danger of innocent looking legislation that will further chisel on the public domain, public resources and public rights. Much of this is accomplished by electing men to Congress who are willing to raid all the taxpayers for a spending spree that will influence votes in the home state.

We have arrived today at a point where the majority of State and Federal agencies dealing with resources are better equipped in experience, in manpower, in technical training and in general know-how, and with more funds and larger budgets, but they are facing by far the greatest challenges they have ever had to meet.

The amassed wealth of this nation came from the land, from the bowels of the earth, from the forests, the corn and grain fields, from the sea; and contributions being returned whether through taxation or otherwise are not paying for the exploitation that created that wealth. This small amount of conscience money will never pay for the original destruction of resources, and if the conservation of resources is to ever become a part of our national living pattern, conservation practices must begin on the land at the time the raw materials are taken. Amassing wealth and then developing hobbies such as passing out gratuities for conservation fellowships or some other type of lip service to resource management is not going to save the resources of this nation; and it will
not save the nation. If this nation is going to be honest in its appraisal of resource values, then let us place the effort where it will do some good.

The word progress and the catch phrase "the greatest good for the greatest number" has been given some very tortured and fantastic interpretations when programs have been presented to legislators and to the public.

Public ownership of resources is often used as the horrible example of socialism when said ownership interferes with grabbing a fast buck. On the other hand, the welfare state as it now exists in our midst becomes the acme of humanitarism; but just how much soil erosion has been stopped by a social security number; how many forest fires put out by unemployment compensation; how much sludge has been dredged from our rivers by a minimum wage law?

If the democratic processes are to guide our national destiny they will have to apply to everyone, not just the other fellow; and if they are to be preserved, they will survive only by painful honesty and forthright thinking. --Ernest Swift

CONGRESS AND CONSERVATION

Conservation was prominently in the minds and speeches of the legislators as the 84th Congress passed the half-way mark of its election-year session. After two weeks of political maneuvering following presidential veto of the bill with the rigid price supports, it became apparent that Congress was going to make another serious try at passing farm legislation including a soil bank program.

Immediately after President Eisenhower's veto message, a number of Senators and Representatives, mostly Republicans, reintroduced the soil bank parts of the vetoed bill. Later Chairman Harold D. Cooley of the House Committee on Agriculture introduced H. R. 10875, which in essence was the vetoed bill minus the rigid price supports and certain other features objected to by the President.

At the same time Congressman W. R. Poage (Tex.), second ranking Democrat on the Committee, introduced H. R. 10876, which is like the Cooley bill except that it retains a "domestic parity" plan for wheat and would provide "compensatory payments" for boosting a farmer's crop receipts to 90 per cent of parity. The Poage plan, some observers felt, also would meet with presidential disfavor.

The Committee on Agriculture began executive meetings April 30 on the new Cooley and Poage bills. Both measures retain the Senate-perfected soil bank language that authorizes federal payments for a broad program of soil, water, forest and wildlife conservation practices on lands set aside by farmers as a "conservation reserve."

New Bills Seek Action on Wildlife, Recreation Needs

More concerned about the economic problems of farmers than with the National Forests which come under its parliamentary jurisdiction, the House Committee on
Agriculture has long ignored bills like Congressman Lee Metcalf's H. R. 1823, which proposes to use 10 per cent of National Forest receipts for recreational and wildlife improvements. Conservationists, therefore, were cheered when California's vigorous Clair Engle revealed plans to write legislation on the same subject which would be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which he heads as chairman.

Mr. Engle and a dozen colleagues introduced the new bill April 30. In order to get it referred to the Interior committee under the rules of the House, the sponsors had to leave the National Forests out of the proposal. The Engle bill (H. R. 10846) would apply only to public domain woodlands that are under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Interior. It would set aside $3-1/2 million annually from receipts, to be available when appropriated, for expenditure in federal woodlands exclusive of the National Forests.

At the same time Senators Wayne Morse and Richard L. Neuberger, both of Oregon, gave the Senate a similar but somewhat broader bill, S. 3742. The Morse-Neuberger version would set up a $7-1/2 million program and encompass the Forest Reserves (National Forests) that were created from the public domain, as well as woodlands that are administered by the Department of Interior. The rules of the Senate being different from those of the House, the Morse-Neuberger bill was referred to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which the Hon. James E. Murray of Montana is chairman.

Under either bill, the money would be expended, when appropriated, for the following purposes within the public forests affected:

"(1) the development, maintenance, and operation of such areas for recreational use;

"(2) improvement and maintenance of wildlife habitat thereon; and

"(3) provision for adequate safety, sanitation, and health measures and facilities..."

The bills also provide that when campground fees or other public-use charges are collected on areas that have been "substantially improved for recreational purposes," the receipts shall be earmarked against the total annual fund authorized by the legislation. The money could not be used for land acquisition.

Conservationists will be working for both the Engle and Morse-Neuberger bills, in hopes that somewhere along the legislative line the Engle bill may be broadened by amendment or that the Senate bill may be accepted by the House.

Other Congressmen who introduced bills identical to Mr. Engle's H. R. 10846 include Mr. Wayne Aspinall (Colo.); Mr. Lee Metcalf (Mont.); Mr. Stewart L. Udall (Ariz.); Mr. A. L. Miller (Nebr.); Mr. John P. Saylor (Pa.); Mr. Clifton Young (Nev.); Mr. William A. Dawson (Utah); Mr. Jack Westland (Wash.); Mr. John J. Rhodes (Ariz.); Mr. Antonio M. Fernandez (N. Mex.); Mr. Leon H. Gavin (Pa.); and Alaska's delegate, Mr. E. L. Bartlett.
Senate Boosts Conservation Funds

Meantime the Senate passed the appropriation bill for Interior and related agencies, sharply increasing funds for recreation and wildlife in the National Forests but still falling short of the estimated needs for those programs. The Senate boosted the Forest Service item for "sanitation and care of public campgrounds" to $4 million, almost double the $2,195,000 that had been recommended by the Budget bureau and previously voted by the House.

The Forest Service item for wildlife resources was increased to $500,000, compared to the $230,000 recommended in the Budget and previously voted by the House.

Altogether the Senate raised Forest Service funds by $9,575,500 above the amounts approved by the House, adding the following sums: $500,000 for range resource management; $450,000 for fire protection in southern California; $620,000 for reforestation; $500,000 for range revegetation; $1,300,000 for forest research; $110,000 for acquisition of lands under the Weeks Act and special acts; and $3,780,000 for cooperation with the States and private timber land owners.

The Senate also approved the following additional amounts for items within the Fish and Wildlife Service budget:

Under "management of resources," $100,000 for the fish hatchery program and $750,000 for predator and rodent control; under "investigation of resources," $40,000 for Great Lakes fisheries; under "construction," $108,000 for completion of raceways at the Williams Creek fish hatchery in Arizona; $40,000 for the fish hatchery at Welaka, Fla.; $50,000 for the hatchery at Marion, Ala.; $18,000 for the hatchery at Creston, Monta.; $30,000 to start a hatchery at the Gavins Point reservoir in South Dakota; and $25,000 for the hatchery at Hagerman, Idaho.

The Senate voted to give the National Park Service $250,000 more in construction funds and $82,000 in other increases, bringing the Park's total to a record-breaking $68,020,000. In order to get the "Mission 66" program under way for rehabilitation and improvement of the parks, the House previously had boosted Park Service construction funds by nearly $10 million over appropriations for the current fiscal year.

The Department of Interior appropriation bill was pending in conference committee as this issue of CONSERVATION NEWS was being written.

Dinosaur National Park Bills Introduced

In what many regard as a logical next step following elimination of Echo Park dam from the Upper Colorado Basin development program, Congressmen Wayne N. Aspinall of Colorado and John P. Saylor of Pennsylvania introduced identical bills to change the status of Dinosaur National Monument to that of a national park. The boundaries of the park would be approximately the same as the existing national monument except for some extensions on the south and southeast that would add some 27,000 acres, bringing the total area to 236,989 acres. The tract known as Deer Lodge would be included.
The proposed legislation would authorize the Secretary of Interior to accept donations of land for the purpose of developing suitable parkway approaches from Highway 40. It provides also for the gradual elimination of existing grazing permits.

The Aspinall bill, H. R. 10614, and the Saylor bill, H. R. 10635, were referred to the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Introduction of the measures was greeted by outraged cries from certain parts of Utah, indicating that not all the advocates of Echo Park and Split Mountain dams have given up. It is generally regarded as somewhat more difficult to get a big dam authorized in a national park than in a national monument.

Subcommittee Whittles the Water Pollution Bill

The practice of dumping municipal and industrial wastes into the nearest stream while disregarding the public welfare amounts to a deeply-entrenched, vested interest in the United States. Which explains why even the mildest of pollution-control legislation always has rough sledding, whether in Congress or a State legislature. Actions by the House Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee as April closed proved that H. R. 9540, the Blatnik bill to extend and strengthen the expiring Taft-Barkley law, was no exception.

Subcommittee deliberations had not been completed as this was written. However, these amendments had been tentatively approved: Reducing the total authorization for sewage-treatment construction grants to municipalities from $1 billion to $500 million, the annual authorization from $100 million to $50 million, and the amount available to any one city from $500,000 to $300,000, or one-third of the total project cost, whichever would be smaller; eliminating a venue clause which would have permitted abatement suits outside the federal court district where the interstate water pollution is caused; inserting an "economic feasibility" clause which would permit industrial polluters to base their defense in court on the grounds that abatement would cost them money; and putting a $100,000 ceiling on research fellowship grants.

On the other hand, the Subcommittee made one improvement in the Blatnik bill. It increased the annual authorization for grants to State water pollution control agencies from $2 million to $5 million.

Before final passage, the Blatnik bill has to run the gauntlet of the full Committee on Public Works, the House Rules Committee, the guns of industrial-interest spokesmen on the floor of the House, and finally a House-Senate conference committee.

Some Bills that Need Critical Attention

Despite growing controversy over the reconveyance to former owners of lands at the Jim Woodruff project in Georgia and Florida, the movement to sell off the shoreline areas around Army Engineer reservoirs continues to pick up speed. Two new bills to accomplish this purpose have been introduced. One, H. R. 10386, by Congressman Jamie L. Whitten applies to four projects in Mississippi, the Arkabutla,
Sardis, Enid and Grenada reservoirs. The other, by Congressman James C. Davis, of Georgia, proposes to reconvey lands around the Buford Dam and Reservoir in Georgia.

Good farmers have long scorned the man who "mines" his soil, disregarding the fertility balance upon which future productivity depends. Now Congress has a bill that would seem to give federal tax sanction to improvident land management. Congressman Edward H. Rees of Kansas has introduced legislation to let farmers deduct a "soil exhaustion allowance" from gross income before computing income taxes. The proposed deduction would amount to 5 per cent of the gross income from the land for each taxable year.

The owners of certain kinds of mines and the producers of such valuable minerals as oil and gas have long been accorded the privilege of substracting a so-called "percentage depletion allowance" from gross income before computing taxes. Whether this is a valid tax principle or not, it is based on the fact that minerals are non-renewable resources and eventually will be used up. Modern agronomists and good farmers regard the soil as a renewable resource, one which in fact can be improved under proper management and which should never become exhausted.

**SENATOR HUMPHREY DRAFTS WILDERNESS BILL**

No outdoorsman needs to be reminded that wilderness is a rapidly disappearing thing in America. Places where a man may get himself lost in the woods, hunt without fear of plugging a friend, fish without hooking a buddy, hike without dodging automobiles, or camp beyond earshot of roaring trucks, are becoming increasingly hard to find.

The special value of wilderness is difficult to define, but it is nonetheless real to those who know it. It is an intangible thing sorely missed by a certain stripe of man and deeply needed by many others for whom it unfortunately is often an unknown hidden hunger--especially important in these days when the pressures of everyday living cause queues at the prescription counters for equinol.

Probably all who go hunting and fishing feel the need for wilderness to a greater or less degree. So do hikers and mountain climbers and the youth groups to whom adventure in the outdoors is so important. In fact, nearly all Americans have some interest in the wilderness because of their outdoor backgrounds and its prominent part in our history.

Fortunately there still remain some large areas of wilderness. Most of them are federally owned and included in parks, forests, refuges, or other kinds of reservations within which the wilderness has been saved--so far.

Some fifty or so national parks and monuments have within them unspoiled areas large enough to be called wilderness. Some twenty or so of the national wildlife refuges do, too. Within the national forests there are some eighty areas that have been designated by the Forest Service for protection as wilderness. Indian reservations contain fifteen areas that have been classified as roadless or wild areas.
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Putting all these 165 or so areas together, out of the more than 2-1/4 billion acres in our total land area (of which 741 million acres are federally owned) we have a total of about 55 million acres of wilderness in federal ownership or control. They are parts of public lands within which wilderness can be preserved consistently with other purposes, as part of what might be called a multi-purpose wilderness preservation program.

At present, however, there are no laws of Congress that protect these areas of wilderness as wilderness. Even in the National Parks the pressures for roads and non-wilderness recreational and tourist developments threaten in many places to invade the primeval backcountry. In the national forests the wilderness, wild, primitive, and roadless areas have been set up administratively and could be abolished or greatly reduced by a future Secretary of Agriculture. Wilderness within the national wildlife refuges is in a precarious position because the refuges themselves lack adequate legal protection against pressures for commercial or exploitative encroachments. In fact, none of these areas has the protection that Congress could give by providing for wilderness preservation as a national policy applied to a definite system of areas.

For several years conservation leaders have been studying ways of safeguarding these remnants of American wilderness. Recently, as a result of this interest, legislation to provide some measure of security has been drafted by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota, who has studied the problem in collaboration with the executive committee of the Council of Conservationists and in consultation with leaders in The Wilderness Society. Senator Humphrey has now circulated copies of the draft of the bill and has announced plans to introduce it during this session of Congress. It would be called the "National Wilderness Preservation Act" and has already received widespread support among conservationists.

The Humphrey bill proposes to establish a "National Wilderness Preservation System." This system would be made up of the areas of primeval America that are still wilderness and in federal ownership and capable of being kept that way without interfering with other purposes now being served by these lands. The areas to be included are named in the bill. These areas would continue to be administered by the existing Federal agencies that now handle them. Uses now being made of the areas would be permitted to continue, but the administering agencies would be charged with responsibility to protect the areas as wilderness. There would be no new overhead or coordinating agency created, but there would be a commission to serve as a clearing house for information and a repository for the maps and official papers having to do with the System.

The bill provides that any new mining or oil or gas drilling could be undertaken in a wilderness system area only when the President would declare this necessary for defense reasons. Otherwise the bill is not a reform measure. The grazing now permitted on national forest wildernesses, for example, could continue; special uses now permitted on some refuges would also not be interfered with. National parks would remain inviolate as to mining, grazing, or other such uses. The Secretary of the Interior would designate the parts of each park and monument needed for roads and visitor accommodations, and then the rest of each park would be preserved as wilderness. The bill thus proposes to take the wilderness now suitable for the purpose and provide for its permanent protection under Congressional sanction.
Proponents of the Humphrey bill have emphasized that the proposal is not "special-use" or "special-privilege" legislation.

National forest areas involved, they point out, would continue to be administered under the present Forest Service regulations (which provide, for example, for grazing permits), and these areas also would continue to serve the basic purposes of the National Forests. These purposes are defined by law as watershed protection and forest preservation. Setting these areas aside as wilderness, it is explained, will thus not interfere with the multiple purposes they now serve but will actually help to realize the dominant use of the national forests for water conservation.

National parks, national wildlife refuges, and any other areas would also continue to serve their own distinctive purposes. No special-use privileges of any kind would be created by the proposed law. The only added responsibility of each administering agency would be for seeing that the designated wilderness under its jurisdiction remain wilderness.

The title of the bill describes it as "for the permanent good of the whole people," and the enacting clause says that the National Wilderness Preservation System is "to serve the public purpose of recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, conservation, and historical use and enjoyment by the people."

The section of the bill dealing with uses says that nothing within the Act shall be interpreted as interfering with the purpose for which any of the lands involved were originally set aside, "except that any agency administering any area within the National Wilderness Preservation System shall in its administration for whatever other purpose be responsible for preserving the wilderness character of the area."

"The areas within this System," says the bill, "shall be devoted to the public purpose of recreational, educational, scenic, scientific, conservation, and historical uses and all such use shall be in harmony, both in kind and degree, with the wilderness environment and its preservation."

The executive committee of the Council of Conservationists, which is active in support of Senator Humphrey's proposal, includes David R. Brower of San Francisco, Ira N. Gabrielson and Howard Zahniser of Washington, D.C., Carl O. Gustafson and Fred Smith of New York, and Joseph W. Penfold of Denver. Gabrielson and Zahniser are also chairman and vice chairman, respectively of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources which also has espoused the wilderness bill as one of its "positive projects."

**TRACT PROPOSED FOR NATIONAL MONUMENT IN UTAH**

Proposed withdrawal of 6,440 acres of public land in Emery County, Utah, for possible inclusion in a national monument to preserve important geologic features and unique, fragile formations known as the Valley of the Goblins, was announced recently by Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay.
THE PRAIRIE CHICKEN OFFERS A CHALLENGE

Discussion concerning the prairie chicken at a recent meeting of game managers, technicians, wildlife educators and students held at Goodwell, Oklahoma, pointed toward one important conclusion. The future of the lesser prairie chicken, and some extent to the greater, presents a very real challenge to professional wildlife workers. Although dwindling alarmingly in numbers, there are still enough birds to develop proper management methods and increase their numbers, provided technicians can find the answers. This fact was stated by Dr. A. M. Stebler, leader of the Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit, Oklahoma A. & M. College, Stillwater.

This meeting, sponsored by the National Wildlife Federation, was well attended by Game and Fish Department personnel from the states of Kansas, Colorado, New Mexico and Oklahoma, as well as many others interested in the prairie chicken. Chairman for the two day meeting was William Reavley, western field representative, National Wildlife Federation.

Evidence collected during the discussions reveal the necessity to adopt a three-point program if the prairie chicken is to remain a part of the wildlife scene. Properly controlled management areas on suitable chicken range is one segment of this insurance policy. Another is the stepping up of research on this magnificent bird, with a greater exchange of information between states concerned with the problem. A third segment is the enlistment of interest and support from a larger portion of the general public, especially those from communities where the prairie chicken has long been associated.

SOME GIRLS AND A TROUT STREAM

A few years ago a pretty high school girl named Katy Highland was walking home from school with some of her chums. Their path took them across a bridge right in the middle of the humming resort town that was their home. Beneath this bridge flowed the Ausable River, one of the northeast's fabled trout streams.

Stopping on the bridge as they had done many times before, they surveyed the filth, rubbish, and pollution that strewed the banks and bed of the stream, in plain view of hundreds of heedless passersby.

"Let's DO something about it!" the girls exclaimed almost in unison.

They did too! They cleaned it all up with shovels and rakes. And piled the rubbish along the banks in such mountainous heaps under the very noses of villagers and tourists that finally shamefaced officials of the city sent dump trucks to cart the mess away.

A week later on the way home, Katy and her pals paused proudly on the bridge to survey their job. As they stood there, a worker in a garage on the river bank wheeled out a large barrel of used crankcase oil and laconically dumped it into the stream.
Wasn't there anything that could be done to stop this? Apparently there was - and is. For April 7, Governor Harriman of New York State signed a bill to stop such thoughtless treatment of trout waters. Designed to keep New York State’s trout streams clear of rubbish, the measure forbids the dumping of earth or refuse into any trout stream in the state.

Harriman said in a memorandum that many miles of streams were unprotected by local ordinances and had become littered. He never spoke a truer word, as can be attested by anyone who has driven through the beautiful Adirondack Mountains -- anyone, that is, who has taken the time to stop at a bridge in almost any Adirondack village and take a look downstream.

Governor Harriman, in signing the legislation, said the bill would strengthen considerably the Conservation Department's authority to deal with such conditions. So it looks as though people like Katy Highland, with community pride and the courage to convert it to action, are in for some help after all! --John D. Bulger

MARKET HUNTING RING BROKEN IN TEXAS

With the biggest bag of market hunters in the history of the Fish and Wildlife Service enforcement program either now in custody or out on bond, Service officials are "catching up the loose ends" of the big job.

Service administrators have revealed that 53 warrants were issued for game law violators who have taken an estimated 100,000 ducks and geese from the Beaumont-Houston-Galveston area in Texas during the past two years. Forty-four of these were arrested and arraigned on April 18 and 19. Three are known to have left the State and six others are still being sought by State and Federal officials.

The sweeping action in the Houston area -- more than two years in the making -- far outdistances the big Fish and Wildlife Service raids of recent years -- the one at Reelfoot, Tennessee, a few months ago which resulted in the arrest of 18, and the raid in Sacramento Valley, California, in March of 1954 which also landed 18 poachers.

Market hunters, Fish and Wildlife Service officials say, are extremely hard to catch. Picking them up one at a time would result only in making others more careful. Hence the slow and arduous task of getting enough evidence on enough violators to merit mass arrests which catch all or nearly all of the violators before many can get away or destroy valuable evidence.

The pattern of market hunting varies, officials say, but generally there is either a working agreement among the poachers of an area or at least a comrade-ship which permits the establishment of a "tip-off" system for real or imagined danger. In some instances the poachers are well enough organized to have out-riders patrolling the area in which the illegal shooting is being done.

Unfortunately, the market for illegal ducks and geese is large, Service officials say. Generally the best markets are with clubs operated by persons who see no moral or actual crime in violating the game laws, and with individuals who are willing to wink at the law to get unusually large numbers of wildfowl for big
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parties or other social occasions. Then there is still another market composed of persons who like to eat ducks and geese but who prefer to purchase the birds rather than go out and hunt them.

There were United States game management agents from eight states, 12 Texas State game wardens and several United States marshalls engaged in the recent clean-up of market hunters in Texas. These men operated under the direction of L. T. Merovka, regional supervisor of game management agents for the Fish and Wildlife Service at Albuquerque, New Mexico.

**WATERFOWL SURVEYS WILL BEGIN MAY 1**

More than 400 American and Canadian Wildlife specialists will participate in the annual waterfowl breeding ground survey which will begin May 1, and in the duck banding program which will start late in June, according to John L. Farley, director of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Data from the breeding grounds survey will be used with information from the winter waterfowl inventory and last year's hunter kill survey as a basis for discussions leading to preparation of regulations for the next hunting season.

The breeding ground surveys will cover Alaska, Canada and approximately 30 States. There will be 31 airplanes used in the work, carrying 68 wildlife specialists who will cover between 80,000 and 100,000 miles while counting ducks during the summer. In addition there will be about 240 men who will conduct surveys on the ground and 104 men in the banding operations. One plane will be used in the banding work on the Canadian prairies to assist crews in locating banding sites.

The task is a cooperative one, with personnel being supplied by the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Canadian Wildlife Service, Ducks Unlimited, the Wildlife Management Institute, the Canadian provinces and the various States.

**CHAMBER OF COMMERCE URGES CURB ON MILITARY LAND GRAB**

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States has given "strong support" to legislation providing that withdrawals or reservations of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States must be approved by Congress.

The Chamber also recommended that the proposed legislation be amended to provide for public hearings in each state affected by such withdrawals or reservations. This would permit county, state and local citizens to give their views. In a letter to Congressman Clair Engle, chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and sponsor of the legislation, the Chamber said:

"The number and size of public land withdrawals for defense purposes, especially in the western states, has reached such proportions in recent years that certain states are having trouble financing local and state government functions. These are states in which a high percentage of land is off the tax rolls because of federal ownership. Further withdrawals of large acreages of land for military use in these states will make the problem more acute because most productive revenue-producing uses of these lands is curtailed."
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