

9-13-1918

Resolution 1918-07-08 Permanent Fund (Tabled; See Resolution 1918-09-08)

Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies

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

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

Recommended Citation

Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, *Resolution 1918-07-08 Permanent Fund (Tabled; See Resolution 1918-09-08)* (1918),
Available at: http://digitalcommons.law.msu.edu/afwa_reso/1076

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.

ing the industry, to be based upon the laws of those states having the longest experience with the question and that such laws should include:

1. The licensing of the game breeder.
2. The tagging of the game under the authority of the state.
3. The inspection of game farms, reports, etc.

The President, Mr. Alexander: Now, gentlemen, you have heard the reading of the resolution; what is your pleasure?

Mr. Leavens: I move the adoption of the resolution.

(Whereupon the motion was duly put and unanimously carried.)

Mr. Burnham read the fifth resolution as follows:

(Free Game Farms for Soldiers)

5. Resolved, That the International Association of Game and Fish Commissioners recommend to the National Government that suitable tracts of land in every state in the Union, to be acquired by purchase where necessary, be set aside and devoted to returned injured soldiers and sailors for operation by them as game farms, to the end that wild land in the future may be made to yield its maximum food supply and advantages of recreation and health to the nation.

The President, Mr. Alexander: Gentlemen, you have heard the reading of the resolution. What is the pleasure of the society with regard to it?

Mr. Woods: I move its adoption.

(Whereupon the motion was duly put and unanimously carried.)

Mr. Burnham read the sixth resolution, as follows:

(Plant Black Walnuts)

6. Whereas, The disappearance of the black walnut from the United States is now being very greatly accelerated by the demands of the United States Government, and a valuable timber asset is about to disappear, now be it

Resolved, That all conservers of wild life and forests are hereby called upon to take special measures to promote the planting of black walnut seed nuts during the present autumn and every year hereafter for a period of at least ten years, and be it further

Resolved, That all State Game Commissioners and wardens are especially urged to enter into this work immediately.

The President, Mr. Alexander: Gentlemen, you have heard the reading of the resolution; what is your pleasure?

A Member: I move its adoption.

Mr. Leavens: I second the motion.

(Whereupon the motion was duly put and unanimously carried.)

Mr. Burnham read the seventh resolution, as follows:

(Parmanent Fund)

7. Resolved, That the by-laws be amended so as to contain the following provision:

At the close of each fiscal year, the treasurer shall transfer to the Permanent Fund Committee one-half the balance remaining in his hands after the payment of all outstanding obligations of the Association. The Permanent Fund Committee shall hold all funds committed to its charge whether received from the Treasurer as aforesaid from life membership fees or from other sources, as an endowment fund and the same shall not be used for current expenses except upon the written approval of the Treasurer and a majority of the Permanent Fund Committee.

The President, Mr. Alexander: Before putting the resolution, has there been an authorization of the appointment of a permanent fund committee, or does the resolution provide for that?

Mr. Burnham: Mr. President, we recommend the appointment of a permanent fund committee.

The President, Mr. Alexander: It does not appear in your resolution, and it did not appear in your recommendations this morning, is the reason I asked the question.

Mr. Burnham: I thought it did in the recommendations this morning. It is written in there.

The President, Mr. Alexander: Oh, I am in error, then, I did not catch that. You heard the motion, gentlemen. Is there a motion for its adoption?

Mr. Graham: I move that it be adopted.

(Whereupon the motion was duly put and unanimously carried.)

Mr. Burnham: This final resolution is reported without prejudice. Read resolution with regard to Alaska matter.

Mr. Garfield: I move the adoption of the resolution.

The President, Mr. Alexander: It is moved and seconded that this resolution be adopted. Is there any discussion?

Mr. Houser: Mr. President, I am not well enough posted, and I do not believe there is but one man in the room well enough posted to vote intelligently on that resolution. For that reason, I shall vote against it.

Mr. President, Mr. Alexander: Is there any further discussion?

Mr. Hornaday: Mr. President, may I be permitted to say something on that?

The President, Mr. Alexander: Dr. Hornaday, you are recognized.

Dr. Hornaday: Mr. President, I feel a very deep interest in the welfare of the fish and game interests of Alaska. That interest is at least twenty years old. Now, I think we can all agree upon this proposition, that the fish and game of Alaska are now in an unsatisfactory condition so far as conservation laws and ways and means for the enforcement of conservation laws are concerned. I think that the people of Alaska and the people of the United States who are interested in Alaska are face to face now with a very great piece of constructive work. I think that it needs to be approached in a very liberal spirit and in a most serious spirit. The situation can be injured by the wrong kind of effort, but on the other hand, if approached in a logical way, it can be greatly benefited, and the wild life of Alaska can be better conserved than it is at present.

Now, there is just one observation that I wish to make in regard to that resolution. I believe that the territory of Alaska is not sufficiently populous, and not sufficiently wealthy, and that there is not sufficient taxable property, to afford by legitimate taxation the revenue that is absolutely necessary for the proper conservation of the fish and game of that great territory or country. I think it is too new. I think that a large amount—a considerable amount of money annually should be devoted to the fostering of the fish and game of Alaska from the national treasury. Now that is not going to be possible if this resolution is the idea that it is the basic principle of this resolution if carried into legal effect. If the game and fish of Alaska is turned over to the people of Alaska for their sole management and sole jurisdiction, of course the National Government will not make any appropriations for its support. The burden—the financial burden as well as the administrative burden—will rest solely upon the people of Alaska,

of whom there are only sixty thousand. I think it is not to the interests of Alaska that that whole burden should be assumed by the people of the territory. I think that the interest of the United States as a whole—I might even go so far as to call it the vested rights of the people of the United States in the welfare of Alaska—demand that the United States treasury shall carry a very considerable portion of the financial burden of the conservation of the fish and game of that territory. If I were an Alaskan I should take that view.

I am bound to say, though, that when I talked this matter over with Judge Wickersham, the Alaskan delegate in the House of Representatives, I found that he believes in the spirit of that resolution. When I put the question to him squarely, he said, "I think it will be better if the people of Alaska are given the entire jurisdiction of their fish and game, even at the cost of federal support."

Well, to those of us who are sincerely and disinterestedly interested in the welfare of the fauna of that great territory and the commercial fisheries, I think that we feel bound to take a different view. I think the government should shoulder the burden and that could be done in the matter one way or the other, but having the interests of Alaska fish and game sincerely at heart, I feel bound to point out, now that the subject has been brought forward in this manner, what I regard as a real danger in this proposition. I think that it is entirely possible for the people of Alaska and the government of the United States to get together on this great question and resolve it on perfectly logical and just grounds, so that the people of Alaska shall have all of the say in regard to the disposition of their fish and game that they really need or desire, without at the same time forfeiting the financial support of the national treasury. (Applause.)

Mr. Graham: Mr. President, it seems to me, if it is a financial proposition that Dr. Hornaday objects to, we have a precedent in every state of this Union. In Maine, for instance, they have absolute control of the oldest fisheries; the government is spending thousands of dollars every year to help them. The same is true in Massachusetts and other states. Why not in Alaska, even though the Alaskan people control their fisheries? This is mostly a commercial proposition, and commercial interests will there, as in California and Washington, contribute immense sums for this work, even if controlled by Alaska. I should think that would take care of that.

Mr. Carpenter: This resolution has come on us, I think, very largely, out of a clear sky. So far as I am aware many of the members present here today have not known it was coming, and have not had opportunity to get all of the light upon it that they might like to have. Now it has occurred to me, as I have listened to the reading of the resolution and to the very able discussion, that there may be possibly other reasons why the resolution might have been presented here than financial reasons, important as those reasons are. Now, of course, we all understand clearly the ownership of fish and game is in the sovereign, and the sovereign in this particular instance is the people of the United States, whether they are in New York state or Florida or California or Alaska, and it seems to me that until the people of Alaska have become sufficiently numerous and have complied with all of the requirements necessary for induction into the Union as a sovereign state, it is possibly open to very serious question whether the sovereign control of the people of the country in this great public resource should be turned over to a very small number of people.

Furthermore, we have found even among the sovereign states of the Union that in instances—for instance the various states have not given the care which they should have given to fish and game in the case of migratory birds. Because certain of the states have been delinquent and have not cared for the resources that were temporarily within their borders, we have all advocated a federal migratory bird act; and this Association and the individual members here are absolutely and unqualifiedly upon record as favoring federal control of the wild life that is migratory from state to state; in other words, a federal control of all of the wild life that the federal

government can control, simply because the individual states have not gotten together and controlled it properly in every instance. Now that leads me to ask one question, and that is: What is the real reason, the real motive, behind the introduction of this resolution?

The President, Mr. Alexander: That has not been explained by the mover of the resolution.

Mr. Carpenter: I should like to ask one or two questions following that: Has this resolution really been introduced because of the federal control of wild game of Alaska is too stringent too much along conservation lines, to suit certain interests in Alaska? Has the federal government been a good warden of the Alaskan game? Or, on the other hand, has the federal government been too poor a warden, so that the people of Alaska want to step in now and save what is left of the wonderful Alaskan big game herds from destruction?

Now, if the federal government has been dilatory in its duty, possibly the solution is to turn this over to the people of Alaska. If on the other hand the federal government has not been dilatory, and is still exercising all of its duties under the sovereign right, why should this Association favor a resolution to put the matter entirely into the hands of the number of people still so small that they may not be incorporated as a state?

It seems to me that before this Association jumps precipitately into favoring of this resolution, that it ought to understand the subject very thoroughly; and because it does not understand it so thoroughly, and because there has been so little light directed upon it, Mr. President, I move that the resolution be laid upon the table.

Mr. Walling: Mr. President, I will ask the chairman to withdraw that for a moment.

Mr. Carpenter: All right.

Mr. Walling: Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the spirit of this resolution. I believe in home rule and local self-government, and I believe that the people of Alaska, constituting as they do a separate sovereignty, know better how to protect and conserve their natural resources, as they consist of birds, game and fish, than does the federal government. They are not asking that any migratory birds that pass temporarily or sojourn for a season in Alaska be not protected by the federal government.

I was very much impressed this morning with the very strong appeal which Mr. Garfield made in behalf of the protection, by the territory of Alaska, of these fast diminishing assets. Now the territory of Alaska has been created for twelve years. Perhaps at that time the crying need of local control of the birds, game and fish was not apparent. But things have changed. Men on the spot there see these assets vanishing. It is mighty hard, Mr. President and gentlemen, to administer properly a law dealing directly with an internal situation four thousand miles away from base. Now the right of home rule and local self-government is inalienable to the people, I hold; that is to say, where it deals directly with a local and internal and domestic situation, and if the people of Alaska desire this, I hold that we owe it to them. The conservationist has a right to help them get it, and all that is required would be merely to amend the act creating the territory of Alaska, conferring upon the territorial legislature that extra legislative jurisdiction to the end that they may legislate upon this question.

Now I am not absolutely wedded to the proposition of passing the entire jurisdiction. If the federal government considers it necessary, why they can supplement any appropriation that is lacking in the matter of the administration and enforcement of the law. I have been informed by Mr. Garfield that sixty thousand dollars annually is collected by the federal government as a salmon tax. Is that right, Mr. Garfield?

Mr. Garfield: Yes.

Mr. Walling: And that the territory likewise collects a small tax, that being merely from the salmon fisheries alone. The territory of Alaska would have \$120,000 to administer by force of law. I thank you for withdrawing your motion.

Mr. Carpenter: Mr. President, it is apparent that there is some division of opinion, that there are clearly two sides to this case, and if that is so, the two sides certainly ought to be measured and weighed most carefully. Before I introduce my motion, which I withdrew at the gentlemen's request, I should like to point out first that Alaska is not a sovereign state. Alaska is a territory of the United States, not yet sufficiently well organized and populous to be admitted as a sovereign state.

Further, I want to give just one little bit of a sidelight upon game conditions up there in Alaska and what is being done with the game. As a member of the Camp Fire Club of America, I remember very clearly some very hard work that has been done within the last year by the Conservation Committee of that club, and particularly by Mr. Bulmar Brown, who, with Professor Herschel Parker, of Columbia, were the first to climb Mount McKinley. Mr. Brown reached about as close to the top of Mount McKinley as across a city block, and then the wind almost blew him off the top of the mountain, and he came back with the top of the mountain within reach, with a little slip like from Fifth avenue and Fourth; and he came back and reported all about it. Nevertheless, he was the first man to go up on Mount McKinley, and he came back from Mount McKinley with a marvelous account of the great amount of big game that were still in that vast wilderness, the enormous Alaskan moose, the biggest horned animal in the world, and the Alaskan bear, and the goats and the sheep; and those of you who have read his book on Mount McKinley, and have read his articles in *Outing Magazine*, taken almost word for word verbally from his daily diary, have usually been impressed with the wonderful game resources around Mount McKinley at the time when he went up only a few years ago.

Since that time it has become a settled industry for hunters to go in there. Market hunters kill that game, cut off the hind quarters and the saddles and the finest cuts, load them on the dog sleds, and cart them out to the centers of population in Alaska, where they are sold for meat at a price lower than beef costs in the United States.

Now it was brought out in that fight that Mr. Brown worked so hard upon that, the country around about Mount McKinley was the most natural center for a park, for a game refuge; that unless the congress of the United States took immediate action,—not delayed action, but immediate action,—to create a national park there and a game refuge, we would not have any more of those big Alaskan moose, and the time would come when there would not be any more sheep there.

Now I just want to ask one or two more questions: Did the congress of the United States lie down on that situation and say, "No, we will let all this game be slaughtered, and let this big barren waste up there stay as it is?" They did not. They created a Mount McKinley National Park, and that park stands in Alaska today as a refuge that will preserve to posterity the wonderful Alaskan animals that Mr. Brown found there when he went in two years ago.

Now there are two contrasting situations, the people of Alaska slaughtering the last of their birthright, and the congress protecting it for the people of the country and all future generations. Now before we decide which side of this fence we are going to get on, I think we should go ahead carefully and make up our minds slowly and deliberately which is the side of the fence this Association should jump on.

Mr. President, I again renew my motion to lay this matter on the table.

(Whereupon the president, Mr. Alexander, relinquished the chair to Mr. J. Quincy Ward, of Kentucky, in order that he might address the convention.)

Mr. Alexander: Will you withdraw it just for a moment? There are one or two thoughts which impressed me in connection with this question which I feel it my duty as president of the Association to express. First, I want to say that I have been very much impressed by the splendid presentation of this question by Mr. Garfield this morning, and the earnestness of his presentation of the cause which he represents. However, although Mr. Garfield is the accredited delegate to this Association by a telegram from the governor of Alaska officially to represent Alaska at this convention, we still are called upon here as an Association to endorse a resolution with only a partial hearing. It impresses me with the fact that we have only heard Mr. Garfield's side of the question; we have not heard the other side of the question at all; and there are always two sides to great questions like this. We also are not in a position to judge as to the sentiment of the citizenship of this great district as represented by Mr. Garfield, and as I say as it is a question of considerable significance, personally I would hesitate to cast my vote for a radical resolution to the government without a more complete knowledge upon the question itself. I thank you gentlemen. (Applause.)

(Whereupon Mr. Alexander resumed the chair.)

(The question was called for.)

The President, Mr. Alexander: Mr. Nelson, pardon me, you wish to say something, sir?

Mr. Nelson: I thought it might be enlightening to the members here to know what the situation is in regard to the game laws in Alaska. The game laws in Alaska are not administered from Washington. They are administered in Alaska by the governor. Congress has passed an Alaskan game law, authorizing the governor of Alaska to administer it by game wardens, which serve under the governor, who is a resident, as you know. The same game law gives the secretary of Agriculture the right at any time, when it is shown that any species of game in Alaska is becoming killed to a point which endangers its existence, to issue further restrictions. He cannot enlarge or open up, but he can restrict. Under that law the secretary of agriculture has issued a considerable number of regulations, established from time to time mostly, on representations by the people of Alaska.

For instance, in July we received in Washington a communication—I received it from Governor Riggs,—a communication making certain recommendations for restrictions by the secretary of agriculture. These restrictions originated with Mr. Garfield's organization, I understand. As you know, within a week of the time that those recommendations had been received from Governor Riggs, the secretary of agriculture had issued the regulations further safeguarding the game of Alaska. We at once sent a cablegram to Governor Riggs that his recommendations had been issued as he recommended; and those recommendations for the further protection of Alaskan game are now in existence.

You have in the present situation an elastic law which works very well for the protection of game. The Alaskan law is not perfect, and there is room for constructive changes in the Alaskan game law. But I would sincerely believe that by certain changes I think we could come to an understanding between Washington and the people of Alaska to bring about and still continue that dual control whereby you have the power in Washington further to protect when necessary instead of waiting two years for action by a legislature or by congress when you cannot tell how many years it will take. You have the immediate action of the secretary of agriculture—as I say, in the instance I cited, it occurred within a week—in which the game can be protected.

Now two years ago we received a request from the citizens of the Kenai Peninsula saying that the hunters from the government railroad camps there were slaughtering moose on Kenai—the magnificent Alaskan moose—and unless some regulation was issued, stopping the sale of game, the moose of Kenai would be exterminated that winter. The secretary of agriculture, on my recommendation, at once issued an order stopping the sale of game on the Kenai, and after that we received word—the following spring—that that order had undoubtedly saved five hundred moose from being slaughtered for meat by people from the railroad camps. So that it is apparent that under the present law you can get pretty prompt action in handling the game situation in Alaska.

The weaknesses in the law and the necessary changes can undoubtedly be brought about by mutual co-operation, and it appears to me that that would be as far as the interests of the Alaskan game is concerned. I think that will be a more preferable arrangement than the methods proposed in the resolution. (Applause.)

The President, Mr. Alexander: Is there any further discussion?

Mr. Garfield: Mr. President and gentlemen, before this thing is allowed to come to a vote, I want to answer the question Mr. Nelson and the other gentlemen here in this way, that the government, it is true, through the operation of the bureaus, has provided a good game law for Alaska, that is, as good as they could do under the circumstances. Under that game law they have prepared regulations which are excellent, but they have absolutely failed through one cause and another to provide funds for enforcing the law.

Mr. Nelson: That can be provided, Mr. Garfield, by proper representation from Alaska. The government of Alaska has been requested in two different years to ask for a larger appropriation from congress. It is a matter of the people in Alaska getting busy and making the proper representations to get the money to enforce their own game law.

Mr. Garfield:— One of the purposes of this resolution was to bring the matter before this body to get your unqualified help along proper lines. Now if we come before congress and ask that body for \$50,000 for the purposes of the enforcement of this game law we want your assistance to get that through. (Cries of "Good" and applause.) As I said this morning, what is the use of passing laws and regulations and allowing a smattering of men in a large territory to carry them out?

But the game question is only half of the situation, and before I leave this I want to add this in relation to the matter that Mr. Nelson just spoke of in connection with the moose slaughter in Kenai Peninsula. The regulations promulgated by the bureau provide for the killing of three deer in season, extending from the 15th day of August to September, and that no deer shall be killed unless they have antlers at least three inches long. The United States army posts, located at Seward, particularly sent out their men every fall, and in platoons of thirty and forty they go out to a certain section of the country; they form a drive; they go upon a side of the mountain, and in certain deer pastures and prairies, and gather in all the deer within that circumference, and point them to the beach, and kill every deer in the bunch, buck, deer and fawns. They do it in the fall of the year, when the fawns are what we call tow-heads. What is the use of enacting laws by the federal government for the protection of deer and permitting such drives and such slaughter?

Now, gentlemen, I am telling you the truth. I am not standing here and making grandstand talk on a proposition that you might think to be a dead issue. But with us it is a vital issue, and also with the nation at large. Stringent efforts are being made to protect the game all over the United States as a heritage to the rising generation. Now are you going to make the last stand of the game in Alaska a shambles to satisfy the whims or desires of a few people? The people of the territory are opposed to that.

Now, as I said before, the game question is only half of this side of the situation. The fisheries is far more important. The game product of Alaska amounts probably to a million dollars a year, including the reindeer. The fisheries will amount this year to between fifty and sixty million. The government provides a meagre force of eight men, as I told you this morning, to control the coast line, and the innumerable rivers, for the purpose of protecting the propagation of the salmon in the natural way. In spite of that, from thirty to forty per cent of the pack this year, it has been estimated, has been made from fish taken on the spawning beds when unfit for food. If we come before congress, asking that they provide fifty, one hundred, or two hundred thousand dollars for a proper patrol fleet and proper men to handle that situation, we want your assistance. (Applause.)

These are vital questions with us. We want you with us. I do not care whether you pass that resolution, that way; if you will support us in our just demands, we will try and make you see them as they are. I have come here, as I said, four thousand miles, from the territory of Alaska, probably the first representative of Alaska to this convention. It has been a considerable loss to me. I have felt, and our club have felt, and the people who talked to me in Alaska before I left have felt, the Council of National Defense took this question up; it was discussed pro and con; it was pre-

sented to the food administration; it was discussed there, and the last thing Mr. Purley, the food administrator for Alaska, told me was, "When you go down there you insist upon the proposition that it is not necessary to the food interests of Alaska or the food interests of the nation, as we see them, to destroy the salmon that come there every year to breed, and in time, a few years, entirely destroy the species, and deprive the country of one of the most valuable food assets that it has."

Now I have sufficient backing for this, gentlemen. I am not coming here on my own motion entirely, but I have sufficient backing from the governor, from the Council of National Defense, and from the food administration, that has considered all these questions, and I want to tell you this, that the action that was taken in relation to the indiscriminate slaughter of game animals and fish for the purposes of adding to the food supply as a war measure being turned down through the eastern sentiment was very gratefully received in Alaska, indeed, because we did not see the necessity of it, and we do not see it today, and we hope that it never comes to pass. (Applause.)

You have assisted us in material ways, Dr. Hornaday, Mr. Brown, Mr. Sheldon, and others, and Mr. ———, the gentlemen who is now or was at the head of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. Ward: E. Lester Jones.

Mr. Garfield: Dr. Jones, they have come out very prominently on these questions; they have taken stands. But I believe Brother Sheldon is mistaken on his brown bear question, because as I remarked a while ago, up at King Island the brown bear has eaten the sheep up as fast as the government has put them there. I think that is somewhat exaggerated. I know that the brown bear on Kodak Island would kill a few cattle and a few more sheep, and in one or two instances when commercial interests took flocks of sheep up there in the spring the brown bear devoured them all before fall. But that's another question. We want to have the brown bear eliminated if possible, but if you gentlemen on the eastern coast and throughout the United States want to maintain the brown bear to come up there and kill them once in a while you will have to pass some measures to protect the people against the depredations of the brown bear, because we know a few instances, and Mr. Sheldon knows himself that he went up against a brown bear on the shores of Glacier Bay, and it was a fight between him and the bear, and the bear came pretty near getting the best of it, and yet he favors the brown bear, and of course in the event the people of Alaska will say all right, we can give a native and a Jap or two to the brown bear, if the people want the brown bear to come to shoot it, for that purpose.

But before I leave the question, we want assistance. We want not only passage of laws but we want the enforcement of those laws, and we want the means by which those laws shall be enforced. If we could have men like Mr. Nelson as commissioner of game and fish in Alaska, and he would come up there, with his knowledge, we would depend upon him to administer those laws and to fill in whatever might be required or necessary from time to time as different situations arise. But we do not want some little fellow from a college; we do not want any seventy-five dollar a month man. We do not want some ordinary man or some fellow you pick up here or there and put them in charge of the conservation of game and the protec-

tion of the fish. We want men with experience. We want men of action. We want men to see a thing that is necessary and do it when they see it. I thank you. (Applause.)

Dr. Hornaday: Mr. President, will you listen to a suggestion from a bystander?

The President, Mr. Alexander: Indeed we will, sir.

Dr. Hornaday: Mr. President, it seems to me that in view of all the circumstances, in view of the fact that this Association is now face to face with this constructive question, it would be a great pity for this meeting to adjourn without putting on record some expression of its sincere interest in conditions in Alaska respecting fish and game, and a desire that those conditions should be improved. It does seem to me that if Mr. Garfield and the committee of resolutions would retire for the space of about five minutes they could frame a resolution that would be perfectly satisfactory to this organization to adopt, and that would represent its general interest in the subject, its desire to be helpful, and it would mark the beginning of this great movement.

The President, Mr. Alexander: I thank you.

Mr. Woods: Mr. Chairman, I move this matter be referred as suggested by the gentlemen to the resolutions committee, as stated, and to report back immediately to this meeting.

Mr. Garfield: I second the motion.

The President, Mr. Alexander: All right.

Mr. Burnham: Mr. President, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration. (Reads following resolution:)

(Cession of Bird Reservation to United States)

8. Resolved, That the International Association of Game and Fish Commissioners, in view of the vital importance of preserving breeding and resting sanctuaries for wild fowl in western United States and in view of the existence within the states of Oregon and California of the Federal Bird Reservations of Klamath and Malheur Lakes, the most notable wild fowl resorts in western North America, urgently recommend that the states of Oregon and California at the next sessions of their legislatures, cede jurisdiction to the United States of such parts of these lakes and surrounding lands as are now held under the title, Federal Bird Reservation.

I move the adoption of this resolution.

(Whereupon the motion was duly put and unanimously carried.)

The President, Mr. Alexander: We will now have a report, while the resolutions committee is at work, from the auditing committee. The resolutions committee will please retire with Mr. Garfield and get the report back to us as quickly as possible. The chairman of the auditing committee, Mr. Cobb, will make his report.

REPORT OF THE AUDITING COMMITTEE

By Mr. E. W. Cobb, of Minnesota, Chairman.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen:

We, your auditing committee, beg leave to submit the following report:

We have examined the books of the treasurer and from them we find that during the year 1917-1918 he has collected \$786.23, and has paid out \$662.65, leaving a balance of \$123.58, as shown by his report.

Respectfully submitted,

**EBEN W. COBB,
W. D. HOUSER,
J. G. JOHNSON.**

Adopted.