

Michigan State University College of Law
Digital Commons at Michigan State University College of Law

Resolutions

The (International) Association of Fish & Wildlife
Agencies Conservation Collection

8-29-1941

Resolution 1941-14-14 Post Defense Activities

Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.law.msu.edu/afwa_reso

 Part of the [Environmental Law Commons](#), [Military, War, and Peace Commons](#), and the [Natural Resources Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, *Resolution 1941-14-14 Post Defense Activities* (1941),
Available at: http://digitalcommons.law.msu.edu/afwa_reso/955

This Conference Proceeding is brought to you for free and open access by the The (International) Association of Fish & Wildlife Agencies Conservation Collection at Digital Commons at Michigan State University College of Law. It has been accepted for inclusion in Resolutions by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons at Michigan State University College of Law. For more information, please contact domannbr@law.msu.edu.

U. S. FOREST SERVICE COOPERATION

Whereas the U. S. Forest Service has expressed its willingness to fully cooperate with the several states and has thereby recognized the rights of the various states by revising their regulations G-20 and G-20-A to W-2 and W-3:

Therefore be it resolved that the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners extend to the U. S. Forest Service its appreciation of this action and for its willingness to cooperate in all future matters involving land-use and game management.

WILDLIFE FUNDS FOR U. S. FOREST SERVICE

Whereas the National Forests comprise large areas of land that afford food and cover for vast numbers of big game and other wildlife, and

Whereas the proper management of this wildlife environment is essential to the execution of a logical management program for said big game and other wildlife of the several states concerned, and

Whereas present U. S. Forest Service budgets do not adequately provide for these wildlife activities:

Therefore be it resolved that the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners does hereby recommend that adequate U. S. Forest Service funds be made available to finance these wildlife activities, and

Be it further resolved that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Wildlife Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, Washington, D. C., and the U. S. Forest Service, Washington, D. C.

APPRECIATION OF COURTESIES

Whereas the members and guests of the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners have been royally entertained at their 35th annual convention and were extended every possible courtesy and consideration during their visit to St. Louis:

Therefore be it resolved that the Association hereby express its sincere appreciation to all those who assisted in making the convention such an outstanding success.

We especially wish to thank the Missouri Conservation Commission, particularly Mr. E. S. Stephens, Chairman, and Mr. I. T. Bode, Mr. Arthur Clark, and the other talented members of their staff, the city of St. Louis, the St. Louis Convention Bureau, the St. Louis Entertainment Committee, Mr. August A. Busch, Jr., the Hotel Statler and the St. Louis Chapters of the Missouri Wildlife Federation for the genuine hospitality shown us and for the unique entertainments, which made our brief visit exceedingly pleasant.

We also extend to the press our gratitude for the splendid way it reported the proceedings of our 35th annual convention. Never before have our proceedings been so fully and accurately covered, and we commend the reporters and newspaper managements for their efficiency.

POST DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Whereas it is recognized that there will be a great need for useful and productive employment throughout the nation immediately upon the cessation of national defense production and the demobilization of national defense forces; and

Whereas it is recognized by the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners, meeting in St. Louis with the American Fisheries Society, August 27, 1941, that wildlife conservation is a vital and essential program for America:

Therefore be it resolved that the President of the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners and the President of the American Fisheries Society appoint a joint committee, composed of members of both associations, to secure from the various states, not later than January 1, 1942, a planned and comprehensive list of possible and feasible projects that will promote and develop wildlife and related resources in the various states, and also that a copy of all plans and recommendations received thereunder should be forwarded to the Director of the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service for future use and planning; and

Be it further resolved that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Director of the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service and that he be requested to furnish the various states a list of projects which may be acceptable and in order under the scope of this proposed activity, and that a tentative outline of the desired projects be furnished therewith.

Mr. Wm. F. Chisholm (Louisiana): I move the adoption of the report of the committee, with the exception of Resolution No. 10, with regard to the Mundt Bill, and that this resolution be tabled for subsequent action.

The President: There was a motion to act upon the resolutions except the one applying to pollution, the Mundt Bill. Is there a seconder to that motion?

(The motion was seconded by several members.)

The President: Then it is moved and seconded that we act upon the resolutions en bloc, except the one with reference to the Mundt Bill, which is to be acted upon separately.

(The motion was agreed to.)

The President: It is so ordered. Now I am ready to receive a motion to act favorably upon the other resolutions — all except the Mundt Bill. What is your pleasure with respect to all the resolutions except the one on pollution?

Mr. Chisholm: My motion included the adoption of the report of the committee, with that exception.

The President: I did not so understand. It is clear, then, that the convention has formally agreed to the adoption of all the resolutions except the one on pollution. I take it that is the sense of the meeting. We will consider now action upon No. 10, the Mundt Bill — pollution abatement.

Mr. Talbott Denmead: I move that the resolution be adopted.

Mr. Poe: I second the motion.

The President: It has been moved and seconded that Resolution No. 10 be adopted.

Mr. Chisholm: With respect to this resolution I take the same position, that of an unregenerated heretic, that I took in Detroit a couple of years ago — that the Mundt Bill is entirely unnecessary and that it is defective in several points. In the first place, this organization of state administrators cannot consistently support a further invasion of state's rights in the matter of pollution and still condemn invasion of state's rights in the matter of the building of high dams or the taking over of control of non-migratory game in forests. It is very definitely a further extension of the invasion of state's rights. In the second place, it places Federal authority in control of pollution. Our interest in the control of pollution is largely a matter of interest in the preservation of game and fish. This bill places that authority in the Public Health Service. The Public Health Service has demonstrated its interest in the preservation of aquatic life and of all wildlife by the building of monuments to dead wildlife all over the country. Under the guise of mosquito control they have contributed to the drainage of lakes

and of swamps to such an extent that areas which once teemed with wildlife, lakes which once teemed with fish, are abandoned and gone so far as wild-life and fish are concerned. The Public Health Service, if it takes over the matter of pollution, is interested only in sterile streams, not in the aquatic life that might teem in those streams. Its sole philosophy in measurement of the pollutional load is based on *B. coli*. It is interested in the killing of wildlife rather than in its preservation. The philosophy of the Public Health Service cannot be consistent with the teaching of fisheries technicians where in many cases the addition of organic matter is required for the maintenance of proper fish life and for the propagation of fish.

The worst objection, however, is not these, which have been made before. The worst objection is that it attempts to set up so-called drainage basin commissions. Now, the difficulty with state enforcement of pollution abatement is that it has been attempted without a properly informed, properly financed and properly handled commission or state organization that could study and work out the problems with the industries. They have followed the pinwheel method. Whenever pressure was exerted on a conservation body or state board of health that had the authority to act, they responded to that pressure. That pressure brought about other pressures and the pinwheel began to spin; the fireworks began to fly, and the pinwheel went off and left nothing but the burnt ends of distrust and discontent.

Several of the states have adopted within the past few years an entirely different philosophy in the matter of pollution abatement and control. It is a matter of study and cooperation. In Louisiana — and I am speaking now not for the Conservation Department, but for the Stream Control Division of which I am chairman — we feel that we have gone a long way toward a solution of the problem which Kenneth Reid and some others tell us cannot be solved by the states themselves. We have a better than 60 per cent correction in the pulp-mill situation. We have at least an 80 or 90 per cent correction in our 72-mill cane-sugar pollution problem. We have made strides in the last three or four years in the matter of oil pollution. There is now not a single oil refinery in the state — and there are many of them — that is polluting a single stream. We have made sufficient progress to be able to judge as to the entire picture that has been laid before you with regard to the alleged inability of the states to correct this problem. There may be some states that cannot do it, but those states should look for correction within their own borders and not subscribe to this policy of defeatism and futility.

The President: Are you ready for the question? Do you want to discuss it further?

Mr. Hoffmaster: A year ago, when this matter was before the Association, I protested the adoption of any resolution by an organization such as this which is reputed to know where it is going and really ought to know where it is going. I want to supplement what Mr. Chisholm has said by

saying this: that there is no question in my mind that the authority rests with every state — it is within the police power of the state — to dispose of this waste and to correct the situation if a bad situation exists. There is no reason in the world for our going to the Federal Government to clean up our streams within the state unless the question of international or interstate problems is involved. They should be cleaned up by the states themselves. If proper headway is not being made, I do not believe we should go to some other agency; action should be taken in the state which is closest to it.

We have to remember this, too. If this bill becomes law and you people in the states are interested in the disposition of waste in the streams — interested, of course, as fish and game administrators — to whom are you going? Are you Louisianians going to Mr. Chisholm? No; you will have to head toward Washington, and it is a little further to Washington than it is to the capital of your state, to say nothing of its being a great deal more difficult to get things done by having to go to Washington. There is undoubtedly a place in the scheme of things for the Federal Government to take cognizance of the disposition of wastes in our waters, but I do not believe it is in that bill as drawn, and I do not think we should pass a resolution adopting it.

Mr. Chisholm: I did not complete my point, when I was speaking a moment ago, about these pernicious drainage commissions. They are set up without funds; they have no means of support, no means of taxing any public groups, no means of assessing their costs against industry, no means of taking any money out of the pitiful appropriation of \$250,000 set up by the Mundt Bill. But they are given tremendous authority over the states. If a state fails to act within six months after it has been given notice by one of these commissions, the commission may override the ruling of the state itself. The unfortunate part of it is that these uninformed commissions, with no power to spend money or gather information, are to tell the states that are making studies of these problems where they are to head in. The difficulty in all the states that have failed, as Louisiana failed in the past, in the matter of the pollution problem is in the dependence on exactly this type of pollution-abatement practice.

Mr. Tucker: I want to support the position taken by the representatives from the states of Michigan and Louisiana. I think it is improper for this Association, representing as it does widely divergent views, to go on record as supporting a bill concerning which there is much controversy among the membership. Therefore, if you do not have a motion before you, I move you, sir, that the Mundt Bill resolution be voted favorably, and that the resolution be tabled.

The President: The Chair may be a little dense, but I understood Mr. Tucker to move that the resolution be acted upon favorably.

Mr. Tucker: I have to make the motion that it be acted upon before I can move that it be tabled.

Mr. Leffler: I will second the motion to table.

Mr. Graves: I want to second Mr. Tucker's motion to table.

Mr. Talbott Denmead: I rise to a point of order. There is a motion before the house to adopt this resolution, and it was seconded by the gentleman over here; therefore Mr. Tucker's motion would seem to me to be out of order. If he desires to make a motion to table a resolution, that precedes anything else.

Mr. Tucker: My motion is to table the resolution in favor of the bill. The motion before the house is for adoption of the resolution that is favorable to the Mundt Bill. My motion is to table it.

The President: The motion is not debatable. All in favor will indicate by saying "aye"; those not in favor "no."

Some Members: Aye.

Some Members: No.

The President: The resolution is tabled. That is the effect of the vote; the organization does not take action on this resolution.

Mr. Gutermuth: The Resolutions Committee would make a motion that the President of the Association appoint a committee to draft and approve a sportsmen's code or code of ethics dealing with firearms safety and good sportsmanship — a code that can be compiled in such a way that it can be circulated and spread throughout the nation in an economical manner.

The President: Does any one second that motion? It seems to me we are giving the new President a lot of work. I take it that what you are driving at, Mr. Gutermuth, is a sort of code on better sportsmanship.

Mr. Gutermuth: On safety rules, better sportsmanship, and that sort of thing.

Mr. Leffler: I will second that motion if Mr. Gutermuth will include a provision that the President appoint also a committee to work with the various agencies, as suggested a short time ago, in the development of a more intense safety program.

The President: Do you accept that, Mr. Gutermuth?

Mr. Gutermuth: Yes. I believe the one committee could handle both functions.

Mr. Leffler: Then I am happy to second the motion.

(The motion was carried.)

The President: The next order of business is the report of the Time and Place Committee.