CHAPTER VI

EFFORTS ON BEHALF OF SPECIFIC BIG GAME SPECIES

A large factor in the club's promotion of national parks and national forests was the awareness by members that the creation of such areas would preserve many of our most important big game mammals and provide reservoirs for the increase of several species.

Bison

Madison Grant, a prominent member of the club, was one of the founders of the American Bison Society. This group, organized in 1905, led the fight for a congressional appropriation of $40,000 for purchasing and fencing land in western Montana in 1908. This is known as The National Bison Range and comprises 18,541 acres. The society also raised by private subscription $10,560 to stock the range with forty head. This range today has a carrying capacity of approximately 450 head.

The Boone and Crockett Club was one of the early supporters of all efforts to reestablish the bison in a small fraction of its early range. The creation of the Wichita Game Preserve by executive order of President Theodore Roosevelt in 1905 made possible the establishment of another herd on lands administered by the National Forest Service. One of the most important herds lives in the Yellowstone National Park.
In the winter of 1909-1910, over half the Jackson Hole elk herd died of starvation in spite of the efforts of Wyoming residents to make hay available for them.

Public appeal partially organized by the Boone and Crockett Club and the Isaac Walton League brought an emergency congressional appropriation on March 4, 1911 of $20,000 to be made immediately available for winter feeding. The Biological Survey was made responsible for administering the fund.

Another bad winter set the scene for more permanent federal legislation protecting these elk. A bill was put before Congress and vigorously supported by the Boone and Crockett Club. Members of the club worked closely with the Biological Survey and brought as much pressure as possible on House and Senate committees to report the bill out favorably. It was passed as an Act of Congress on August 10, 1912 and created a winter refuge of 2,760 acres. By popular subscription the Isaac Walton League raised sufficient funds to buy an additional 1,760 acres of land. There were many additional lands acquired so that today the refuge totals 23,950 acres.

The club supported all measures to add to the size of the refuge. In all these instances, the club followed its usual method of organizing support on a nation-wide basis including states, other conservation organizations, or
individuals who were sympathetic to the bills. The National Order of Elks had a wapiti conservation committee which brought support from all Elk lodges throughout the nation. Their interest was aroused chiefly by Sheldon.

Grinnell and Sheldon helped to organize a count of elk in Yellowstone in 1917. Despite feeding efforts, 1919-1920 was another disastrous winter. The size of the refuge in Jackson Hole is sufficient to support a herd of approximately 9,000 animals.

Throughout the early history of this elk herd, Theodore Roosevelt and the club vigorously campaigned for killing sufficient elk by hunters so the animals would not multiply to such an extent as to exceed the carrying capacity of their winter range. As in the case of the Kaibab deer, many well-meaning conservationists opposed such killing. The figures on the number of elk starving to death in 1919-1920 helped to change the thinking of many.

In 1918 Henry Graves wrote E. W. Nelson outlining in detail his program to meet the elk situation in the Yellowstone region as far as national forests were concerned. This letter is a fine illustration of Graves' comprehension of the Wyoming elk as a national resource. Among other proposals he recommended extending the southern boundary of Yellowstone Park and curtailing sheep grazing permits in these areas of the national forests affording important segments of elk range.
The club was instrumental in reintroducing and establishing an elk herd in Arizona.

In 1933 the club paid the expenses of a biologist to investigate the status of the Olympic elk. As mentioned in the chapter on National Parks (II), the club supported the movement to enlarge the Olympic Monument to a park and thus insure protection of this elk herd.

In 1926 the President's Committee on Outdoor Recreation, appointed when the National Recreation Conference met, created a special Elk Commission to study and report on the elk problem. Sheldon was chairman of the group, and their findings were written by him and published as a bulletin entitled, "The Conservation of the Elk of Jackson Hole, Wyoming." The program proposed was followed. One of its most important recommendations was that the Biological Survey undertake a comprehensive scientific study of the elk, the results of which would build a firm foundation for long-term intelligent elk management.

In 1927 the Survey appointed Dr. Olaus J. Murie to undertake the study. Murie had just returned from a six-year study of caribou in Alaska and was eminently fitted for the task. Fourteen subsequent years of intensive field work, which certainly accomplished its original purpose, is reported on in Murie's monumental book, The Elk of North America, published in 1951 by the Wildlife Management Institute.
Antelope

Along with the American bison, older club members were convinced at the turn of the century that the pronghorn would never again constitute legal game. Extinction appeared more of a probability than a possibility. In 1911 a letter from the chairman of the Game Preservation Committee (Grinnell) to Hon. Walter L. Fisher, Secretary of the Interior, in regard to the chances of reserving the Ft. Grant Military Reservation in Arizona as an antelope refuge stated in the beginning of the letter: "The club is much concerned about the fate of the pronghorn which appears to be everywhere rapidly diminishing."

Even as late as 1924, Sheldon, in a letter to Grinnell, stated: "Personally, I believe that the antelope are doomed, yet every attempt should be made to save them." This letter was written just before the findings of a careful census of pronghorns by the Biological Survey. The results of this census revealed a more optimistic picture. The numbers were estimated at 30,000.

The club's interest in creating antelope refuges and restocking these animals dates back many years. The club members promoted and subscribed $600.00 in 1910 to transfer antelope from Yellowstone to the Wichita Game Refuge. Subsequently they paid for two shipments from Alberta into the Montana Bison Reserve and to Wind Cave, contributing $3,000 in all. Most of these early efforts were doomed to
failure since experience demonstrated that, unlike bison and some other game species, antelope, after initial increases, finally died off in a fenced preserve.

Efforts to make the old Ft. Grant Military Reservation into an antelope refuge, referred to in the first paragraph, were not successful.

Alarming reports reached club members in 1921 of a heavy killing of one of the remaining remnant bands of antelope in Oregon. It was reported that Basque sheep herders were killing them wantonly; the carcasses of fourteen were found after they had been shot and left to rot. Grant wrote the Governor of Oregon a letter expressing the concern of all game conservation groups over this situation. An expedition was sent out by the state in an attempt to apprehend the men responsible.

In 1927 George Bird Grinnell was in correspondence with E. R. Sans, a Biological Survey predatory animal control employee, in regard to a possible antelope refuge in northern Nevada, a pet project of Sans. About this time, T. Gilbert Pearson, president of the Audubon Society, visited the area and was convinced by Sans that the area was ideal for an antelope refuge.

The necessary lands for the refuge were for sale for $20,000. The club obligated itself to raise half this amount if the Audubon Society raised the other half. The club appointed an antelope committee under the able chairmanship
At the executive committee meeting of November 26, Pearson reported that the negotiations for land for the antelope refuge were nearly completed. Mr. Grant reported that the funds for which the Boone and Crockett Club had obligated itself had been subscribed.

Thus was established the Charles Sheldon Antelope Refuge. The club and Audubon Society jointly had purchased 2,900 acres with good springs of privately-owned land and turned it over to the Biological Survey as an antelope refuge. This was donated on condition the government add to it 30,000 acres of the surrounding public lands. On June 20, 1929, President Hoover temporarily withdrew from entry the required public lands on recommendation of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior. The president agreed to withdraw these lands only after learning the Boone and Crockett Club and the Audubon Society were underwriting the buying out of the private holdings. The total area of some forty square miles at the time constituted the natural summer range and lambing grounds of approximately 2,000 antelope.

Hoover signed the executive order for the refuge on January 26, 1931. On December 31, 1936 an executive order created a 549,000 acre game range adjoining the tract.

The Hart Mountain National Antelope Refuge in Oregon and the Charles Sheldon Refuge are the only major units devoted especially to antelope. The Sheldon area also affords a fine
refuge for sage grouse and other animals of the sage brush plains.

From a strictly game refuge standpoint, the club can look with pride to its part in creating this fine refuge.

It is gratifying to realize that the pronghorn is again legal game in several western states. The national inventory of 1954 gave an estimate of 273,196 with a tabulated kill of 70,223. The inventory figure ranks second behind the various species of deer in the big game roster.

**Alaskan Brown Bear and Grizzlies**

The Boone and Crockett Club has always regarded the bear as a game mammal and found itself in opposition with those individuals and agencies regarding it as a predator. The club fully recognized the need of killing individual bears in the west which had developed the habit of preying on cattle but did not condone the policy of condemning all bears because of the depredations of a few.

As pointed out in an earlier section, it was the policy of the club to support public agencies charged by legislation with management of natural resources. One of its few conflicts with the Biological Survey occurred in 1918 when Mr. Fisher of this agency published an article publicizing the fact that the Survey's predator control branch had killed 87 cattle-killing bears. Although there was some question as to how many of these bears were in fact cattle killers, what disturbed the club was the publicity of the action.
Most people from early childhood are educated by nursery rhymes and folklore to the effect bears are very dangerous. Such publicity by the government on its effectiveness in killing bears simply confirms their preconceived conviction that all bears are dangerous and should be eliminated. This particular instance occurred at a time when there was a great deal of publicity and controversy on eliminating the great brown bears of Alaska, a game mammal the club was valiantly fighting to defend.

In November 1918 the club passed the following resolution:

"On motion duly made and seconded and unanimously adopted it was resolved that the Executive Committee express to Mr. Sheldon their appreciation of his prompt action in having written and called the attention of the Club to the unfortunate situation arising from the publication of an article under the auspices of the Biological Survey in relation to Cattle-killing by Bears in the West and the Secretary was requested to communicate with the Biological Survey on the subject and as soon as possible place the Club in full possession of the facts concerning said article with a view to obtaining a revocation of the action taken by Mr. Fisher authorizing his men to practically exterminate this animal in their respective districts.

"November 22nd, 1918. Charles Stewart Davison. Secretary."
As with most of our large game, the club's interest in bears dates back a good many years. Most of this interest centered around the Alaskan brown bears. Agitation by those attempting to raise cattle on Kodiak Island, and the salmon canning interests to eliminate these great carnivores started many years ago.

The Alaskan Game Law of 1908 recognized the Alaskan brown bear as a game animal and thus it received legal protection. Most of the controversies in later years were engendered by those endeavoring to remove this protection.

Madison Grant wrote to Dr. E. Lester Jones of the Department of Commerce in 1915 regarding a bill pending before Congress to transfer the care of Alaskan brown bears from the Biological Survey to the Bureau of Fisheries. The following excerpts from this letter demonstrate clearly the concern of club members as to the fate of these unique mammals.

"The official reports of the recent governors of Alaska, and the informal reports that reach us from there show an increasing impatience on the part of the local inhabitants at the protection of the great brown bear of Alaska and some of the governors, notably Mr. Walter E. Clark, have been guilty of zoological absurdities in talking about this animal being found in the same litter with the black bear. . . .

"The brown bears are the greatest attraction to visiting sportsmen in Alaska, and as living animals, are
worth infinitely more to the natives and the white population of Alaska than the cash derived from the sale of skins...

"Some of us in the Boone and Crockett Club and in the Zoological Society have felt that the transfer of the care of these bears from the Biological Survey to the Bureau of Fisheries, and their consequent classification as fur bearing animals, would probably be fatal to these animals if traffic in skins were permitted.

"The unfortunate extracts from your report in the New York Times, referring to the injury to the fisheries by bears, eagles, and gulls have resulted in the belief by the public that you were about to advocate their extermination in the interest of the salmon fisheries. Of course, it is not necessary to point out that bears were originally present in great numbers on these same rivers at the time when the salmon abounded in untold myriads, and that the bear, with a few exceptions, catch and eat injured and dying fish or those that have finished their breeding operations. I have been on some of these salmon rivers myself, and ... the toll of good sound fish that a bear can catch is very trifling. The seining at the mouth of rivers by the canneries does a thousand fold more injury.

"I wish to assure you that the Boone and Crockett Club and the Zoological Society, so far as I am in a position
to speak for either of them, will be greatly relieved to hear that you are staunchly in favor of extending instead of diminishing the protection afforded the great brown bear of Alaska. . . ."

Fortunately, the Alaskan bears remained under the administration of the Biological Survey. Efforts to remove restrictions on the brown bear reached a high in the years 1918-1920 at the time Riggs was governor of Alaska.

In a memorandum written by Grinnell on January 9, 1919 for the files of the club, he had this to say:

"I have recently had correspondence with Sheldon about possible action by the Boone and Crockett Club in relation to Alaskan bears. He says that Riggs has written a very drastic report urging the extermination of the bears, the wiping out of all bird reservations in Alaska, and generally reflecting the apparent Alaskan feeling that all protection should be removed from bears and many birds in Alaska.

"Sheldon has worked over Riggs and apparently induced him to accept a number of modifications of the Alaskan views. He has sent me a copy of his letter to Riggs with a memorandum of what he hopes Riggs will put into his report. Sheldon's correspondence ought to go into the files of the Boone and Crockett Club for the benefit of any future game preservation committee."

Since the correspondence Grinnell refers to gives a good
account of the old story of the threat to Alaska brown bears, I include the two pertinent letters and a memorandum below.

Excerpts from Sheldon's letter to Grinnell, dated December 23, 1918, follow:

"I think that the attention of the Game Committee of the Boone and Crockett Club should be called to the very dangerous situation as regards bears of Alaska, which, at any time, may be threatened with extermination in the coast regions. The first thing to bear in mind is the following situation.

"Two years ago some residents of southeastern Alaska wrote to the Secretary of Agriculture, condemning the bears. The Secretary of Agriculture agreed with them and informed Nelson to draw up a bill, taking bears off the protective list and permitting the commercialization of bear skins, to present to Congress. It should be needless to emphasize the fact that with the backing of the Secretary of Agriculture, Congress would soon act favorably upon such a bill.

"Nelson came to me with this matter and it was delayed from time to time until the Secretary of Agriculture had apparently forgotten all about it.

"It should be clearly understood, therefore, that if the Alaska residents make a similar request of the Secretary of Agriculture, he will insist upon taking the bear off the protective list. It should be still more
clearly realized that the only thing that prevents the practical extermination of the coast bears is the fact that the residents of Alaska do not know that the Secretary of Agriculture will grant their request if they make it.

"The feeling on the game question has been running very high in Alaska for the last year. The new governor, Riggs, after his return to Alaska, soon absorbed this feeling. The feeling increased after the issue by Nelson of some new regulations in Alaska, some of which were vicious, others impractical and others absurd. These regulations were put out carelessly, without knowledge of their practical significance.

"I received in October a vigorous letter from the Governor on the game question and a short while ago I answered it personally and somewhat fully expressed my ideas on the game situation in Alaska generally. The idea of the letter was to placate the feeling in Alaska and to urge an effort toward cooperation with organizations here in the United States, to the end that they might finally agree upon a reasonable game law. The principal object of this letter was to endeavor to save the bear, to try to change the opinions of the Alaskans toward that animal.

"Governor Riggs is now here in Washington for a few days. He is writing a vigorous report on the game
question, which, like all Governor's reports, merely reflects current opinion in the country. I have been lunching with him today. I brought him up to see Nelson and we shall meet Thursday morning with the idea of going over the regulations and my particular object is to tone down his report so that it will not intensify the feeling against the opinions of Alaskans on the game question and particularly to modify that portion of it which relates to bears.

"Although I am doubtful of success, yet I hope that even a little may be accomplished. I have urged Biggs to reconsider the bear question and to go back to Alaska and endeavor to get the people to take a broader view of it. I have urged him to get the people together and form some kind of a law which the people would want to see passed, so that the organizations here may have a clearer idea of the practical point of view of the Alaskans on the whole game question. After that, I have suggested to him that it might be well to see if he could not get a committee from Alaska to meet organizations here for the purpose of finding whether it is best to obtain a general agreement on the revision of the Alaska law.

"Of course, my chief object in all this is to prevent the Alaskans from taking any immediate action on the bears by applying to the Secretary of Agriculture. This has been a purely personal matter and I will shortly send
you my letter to Biggs on the subject...  

"I sincerely hope that the conservation groups interested will realize the delicacy of the situation as regards the Alaska bears and also the fact that the Alaskans need sympathetic, rather than antagonistic, attention."

Sheldon's letter to Biggs of December 27 with the memorandum he forwarded, follows:

"I am enclosing a memorandum on the question of bears which I suggested might be used with such additions or changes as you might wish to make to it in your report.  

"Of course you realize that the objections to bears by every Governor of Alaska is a somewhat hackneyed subject since every Governor has advocated their extermination in vigorous terms. The method of handling this question adopted by previous Governors has led to strong antagonism among all organizations outside Alaska and I really believe that it has been perhaps the main reason why these organizations have the tendency so completely to disregard the wishes of the Alaskan people.  

"In this memorandum, therefore, I have endeavoured in a brief and general way to state the reasons why the Alaskans object to the protection of bears and also your concurrence in their opinion. I have added to this, perhaps at some length, your statement of your investigation to ascertain the reason of outsiders who insist on the
protection of the bears. I have further added to it a short discussion of the terms used in the law which at least will convey the accurate intent of the law. I think that if you will include in your report a discussion of the bears made in this way it will not only reflect and emphasize your own opinion and the belief of the residents but also it will tend to placate the antagonism which exists against Alaskan opinion and a feeling will be produced that you are the first Governor who has been broad enough to state both sides of the question, in order that the outsiders may feel that you have been willing to make their own views known to the Alaskan people. That this will be a step toward better co-operation in the future I can assert positively, since of course I have for many years been familiar with the views of outsiders.

"I acknowledge of course the difficulty of restraint when a Governor is dealing with some of the absurd views and methods of those outsiders who attempt to regulate Alaskan affairs. It is quite possible that if I were in the position of a Governor I might not be able to overcome these difficulties, yet, just because I am detached I believe that I realize the future advantages that such restraint will bring and I am very sure that if you will adopt it you will later realize this fact also."
"MEMORANDUM ON THE PROTECTION OF
BROWN BEARS IN ALASKA

"'Brown' bears are included among the game animals in
the present Alaskan law, and as such receive protection
under the terms of the law. I concur with the general
opinion of the residents of Alaska that all bears should
be eliminated from the list of game animals, and that
such protection of them should be withdrawn. 'Brown'
bears on the Kodiak Island have killed domestic stock
and menace the possibilities of establishing the stock
raising industry there. At present cattle have to be
kept in fenced areas because of the dangers of bears.
It will be difficult to establish stock grazing anywhere
in Alaska where 'Brown' bears exist. Bears feed on
salmon when they run up the rivers and thus to a certain
extent reduce the supply. Bears have killed and mangled
many people in the woods and this source of danger to
life and limb should be removed. The extermination of
bears, therefore, would improve the possibilities of
developing Alaska.

"I have made an investigation to ascertain the opinion
of sportsmen and others outside of Alaska for the
purpose of understanding their reasons for wishing to
continue the protection of these bears. They assert that
where bears menace bona-fide stock raising they should
be destroyed. They insist that many of the reports of
bears injuring men are exaggerated, and that while many
cases have proved true, yet considering the proportions of deaths and injuries to men by bears, as compared with the numbers of people who have travelled in the regions where bears exist, it must also be true that dangerous bears are most exceptional, and that the chances of injury from them are very much less than from numerous other accidental natural causes.

"They admit that bears kill salmon, but believe that the toll of salmon thus taken is not of much significance in reducing the supply. They believe that the greater part of the regions inhabited by bears is a wilderness where bears can do no harm, and that the reported dangers and damages by bears does not apply to much of the area where they live - that if protection was withdrawn from bears and their skins were thus commercialized, it would soon lead to their extermination in the coast regions - that the profit accruing from trading in these skins would then cease, and an asset, most valuable to Alaska, would be lost forever - that Alaska and British Columbia will prove the last refuge of the big 'Brown' bears - that previous to the war from fifteen to twenty thousand dollars were spent by outside sportsmen each year in Alaska for the sport of hunting these bears and that in the future the money to be expended for this purpose will largely increase, and also they assert that by thus attracting outsiders to the country, many of whom are
wealthy and interested in the wilderness, an occasional one will invest in the resource of the country, as some have done already; and that these people who have hunted bears sometimes write books and thus advertise the country, and that they make it known by report to others - thus indirectly the bears will prove to be an increasing asset to the country and that it would not be to the advantage of Alaska to destroy this valuable asset which can be maintained by protection so long as parts of Alaska remain a wilderness.

"Alaskans do not understand the term 'Brown' bear. I am reliably informed that it is intended to signify the groups of bears including both the big coast brown bears and grizzlies which recent studies have demonstrated to be more or less related between the extremes of the species.

"The other bears are included in the term 'Black' bear, which includes the true black bears, cinnamon ('brown'), and glacier bears. All these bears have short claws and climb trees, while the bears included as 'Brown' under the law have long claws and do not climb trees.

"These cinnamon bears of the black bear group are constantly confused with the 'Brown' bears under terms of the law. In order to avoid this confusion terms should be used in the law which would accurately specify the bears included."
Copies of later correspondence indicate Riggs was not placated. Well-meaning conservationists in the East wrote some scathing letters to New York papers criticizing the Alaskans for their efforts to exterminate bears. These accounts were picked up by Alaskan newspapers and ran in banner headlines. As in the case of wolves, a few years later the whole controversy was reduced to an emotional fight. The Alaskans felt people in New York were attempting to create their own private shooting preserve in Alaska. Pressure was redoubled on Riggs by Alaskans. Riggs himself was a very high calibre man with great personal respect for men like Madison Grant and Grinnell. However, he represented the Alaskans and the New York newspaper letters above backfired. Riggs felt obliged to represent the aroused Alaskans.

As a result he attempted to at least remove grizzlies from the protected list. Nelson, Merriam and others pointed out that there were coast grizzlies which, in certain parts of their range, were indistinguishable from the coast brown bears. These scientists therefore held that the grizzly bears of Alaska were included in the 1908 Alaska game law protecting "brown" bears. Riggs took the matter to court to get some kind of a decision. Nelson, at that time chief of the Biological Survey, got an opinion from the Solicitor General. Apparently no conclusive decision came out of the whole dispute.

In the heat of this whole controversy an event took place
which was by far the most important blow in behalf of the
great Alaskan brown bear. To the best of my knowledge the
inside story of this is unknown even to the Park Service.
The story is told in a short letter from Sheldon to Grinnell
dated January 4, 1919. It reads as follows:

"I do not know whether it has been called to your
attention that the latter part of September the President
created the Katmai National monument on the Alaskan
peninsula. A member of the game committee of the Boone
and Crockett Club over a year ago was consulted as to
the advisability of attempting to establish this
national monument. He suggested that the limits of the
area occupied by this national monument should be so
drawn as to create a refuge for bears. His suggestions
were adopted and the width of the monument is in places
over fifty miles. Bears are abundant there and hunting
on this area will be excluded, I hope forever. All
have been impressed with the fact that the word bear
should never be mentioned in connection with the
establishing of this monument. It would be wise not to
mention it for the present, yet the fact remains that
owing to the suggestions of the Game Committee of the
Boone and Crockett Club this refuge for bears has now
become an established fact."

Ostensibly the excuse given the public for this monument
was the active volcanoes. Actually, however, it was
established also to make a preserve for the great Alaskan brown bear.

A memorandum by Grinnell recording this event for the club records reads as follows:

"A more cheerful side of the Alaska bear situation is the fact that last autumn the President created the Katmai National Monument on the Alaskan Peninsula, where, I am given to understand, hunting will be forbidden. The boundaries of this monument recommended by a member of the Boone and Crockett Club - Sheldon, of course - are so drawn as to create a refuge for bears. The width of the monument in places is over fifty miles, and bears are abundant there. Sheldon recommends absolute silence on the bear question."

At the annual club meeting in 1931 a resolution was adopted urging setting aside of Admiralty and Chicagoff Islands as brown bear sanctuaries. This was sent to Senator Fred Walcott, a club member, who was then chairman of the Senate Conservation Committee. This effort did not meet with success.

It was peculiarly fitting that the club donated to the great hall on North American big game mammals at the American Museum of Natural History the Alaskan brown bear group. It was resolved at an executive committee meeting in November, 1937, that the club support this exhibit as a memorial tribute to Dr. John C. Phillips. A club member, Mr. Francis Colby,
collected the bears for this group from Kodiak Island.

Of all the big game mammals in the United States, the grizzly bear has been most seriously threatened with extermination. The California grizzly is extinct. If it were not for Yellowstone and Glacier National Parks it is probable the grizzly of our West would be as nearly extinct as the wolf. The last stronghold of this great bear south of Canada is in Montana and Wyoming, including Glacier National Park, where there were estimated to be slightly over 700 in 1954 when there was an estimated kill of 40. Apparently the big brown bears of the Alaska coast are not seriously threatened with extinction. Part of Kodiak Island has been made into a game reserve under the control of the federal Fish and Wildlife Service (formerly Biological Survey) where hunting is permitted under close supervision.

Fortunately grizzlies are still abundant in the more remote areas of Canada, and the interior of Alaska, including Mt. McKinley National Park.

Mountain Sheep

Of all the big game mammals of the West for which club members had concern, later history has proved that there was more reason to fear for the fate of the mountain sheep than any other species with the exception of the grizzly bear.

Unlike deer, elk and antelope, sheep do not respond to protection as do many other ungulates and have proved especially vulnerable to disease wherever an increase in
numbers takes place. Infestation of lung worm has proved the most serious of the diseases. Another characteristic of sheep is that they tend to be relatively local in range, making limited annual movements to lower ranges in winter. The history of the species indicated that bands killed off their local range were seldom replaced by migrants from other better stocked mountain ranges.

Yellowstone National Park and Glacier National Park contain good herds of mountain sheep and there are scattered bands in isolated areas throughout the West. The national parks in which club members took an active part in creating fulfilled the role of providing sanctuaries for mountain sheep as well as other big game species referred to in earlier paragraphs.

In 1919 there was a concerted effort by the club to establish a game refuge in the Black Hills to be named after Theodore Roosevelt and to stock the area with mountain sheep. The game committee report in 1919 gives an account of the early stages of this effort.

"Some time ago, citizens of Deadwood in the Black Hills, changed the name of Sheep Mountain to Roosevelt Mountain and petitioned their Congressman that this mountain and the surrounding area should be set aside by Act of Congress as the Roosevelt Game Refuge. The Congressman referred the matter to the Secretary of Agriculture, who sent out Vernon Bailey, of the
The Biological Survey, to look over and report on the ground. Bailey has made a favorable report.

"Mountain sheep might be captured and delivered in this Refuge, and if left alone would doubtless do well. Even more important than getting the sheep, however, is the plan of interesting all people in the Black Hills in this project, and in securing proper laws and regulations to protect the sheep and their increase, and also in the project of contributing money towards securing the sheep. If they contribute the money they will regard the sheep as theirs and will take more vital interest in them than if the sheep were captured by somebody else and given to them."

The foregoing report illustrates an important policy strictly adhered to by the club in promoting any conservation measures in other states or territories. Members were aware that any such efforts were doomed to failure without the support of local people. Timing of drives for the establishment of refuges or parks was geared to the amount of local backing that could be expected.

The Black Hills project failed to materialize. Often as much energy was expended on programs which never worked out as on those which proved successful.

In 1918 Grinnell and Sheldon carried on correspondence with Mr. G. M. Willard of Arizona who was Arizona Game Director and much interested in establishing game refuges.
The club endeavored to encourage and help him establish the Gila Refuge for mountain sheep as a state refuge. Apparently the effort was not successful.

Among Sheldon's correspondence an interesting letter to Grinnell on sheep conservation was discovered. Dated January 19, 1922, he wrote Grinnell as follows:

"When I was serving here (Washington, D.C.) during the war and chairman of the Boone and Crockett Game Committee, in behalf of the Club, I took advantage of relations which I had established with Governor Cantu of Lower California to persuade him to make a good law protecting game in his state. The result was successful. He established the law which is practically the same in its essential features as that which I suggested. Would it not be well to keep these papers in the Boone and Crockett Club files so that in the future they may demonstrate one of the achievements of the Club?"

Following the exchange of letters reprinted below, Sheldon sent Governor Cantu a suggested game law embodying principles long adopted by the Boone and Crockett Club and to be discussed in a later chapter.

It was evident from other club correspondence that the chief interest of Sheldon and others in Lower California was the desert sheep.
The Sheldon-Cantu correspondence follows:

"February 26, 1919

"To His Excellency
Governor Esteben Cantu

"My dear Governor Cantu,

"I have never forgotten your kindness to me about four years ago when you gave me a signed document for the purpose of avoiding any molestation on the part of your patrols in the Pinacate region when I went to hunt the mountain sheep. My appreciation was very deep and I felt an added pleasure in the realization of the fact, that by this act, I knew you to be a man of sympathies and interests much wider than those of the mere material aspects of affairs, for you thus proved yourself to be interested in the pleasures of the hunters' life in the open. I have always believed that a man who could thus extend his interests and sympathies had in him capacities far above those of other men, even those who possessed marked administrative abilities.

"For all these reasons it has been an exceptional pleasure for me to cooperate, with influence I hope, with Mr. Hutchinson in establishing better relations between you and the United States during the recent War. Difficulties had to be overcome, but I feel grateful that the confidence in you was not misplaced, in fact you have nobly acted up to the reciprocal obligations incurred."
"From 1898 to 1902 I lived in Chihuahua and learned to love the Mexican people and understand their ideals. Much of my life there was spent among the rancheros, vaqueros, and men of the open. I was Manager of the Chihuahua and Pacific Railroad. All my Mexican friends, then cultivated, are still my good friends today. My interest in Mexico is very real. And now when through actual experience I see a Governor of a Mexican State like yourself who has shown such a high degree of administrative ability, who has proved himself not only friendly to a neighboring nation but who has equally proved himself the highest and best type of a loyal Mexican citizen with her best interests at heart, and who has put high ideals into practice and devoted his best work to constructive labor for the development of his State, I feel encouraged to write making to you a suggestion which, if adopted, I believe will not only be of much benefit to your State in the future, but also will, among the best Americans throughout this Country, cause you still further to be respected as a Mexican Governor much more progressive in one aspect than other Governors of the past in Mexico.

"For many years I have been interested in game animals and I have devoted in this Country much time to having laws passed to conserve them. Those who reflect and look ahead and realize it before it shall be too late,
must recognize that the game (animales de la caza) of a country can, by proper protective laws, be made a real and permanent asset. In most of the Western States of the United States much of the game was exterminated before laws were passed and enforced to preserve it - but in the few portions of those States where game now exists in quantities sufficient to attract hunters, many hunting parties go there and each year bring thousands of dollars into these sections. The California game, except deer, is now gone or reduced to numbers so low that it cannot finally survive, and therefore California has lost the asset of the expenditures of hunting parties who might year after year have been attracted to the State for that purpose.

"Because of unrestricted killing in Chihuahua, sheep and antelope are nearly extinct, and it is too late to save them by protective laws. Conditions in Sonora are rapidly approaching a similar state of extinction.

"But in your State of Lower California mountain sheep, antelope, and deer still exist in numbers great enough to attract sportsmen. This region is now considered by American and even English sportsmen as the most attractive accessible place to go for sheep. Without any doubt, in the future, after the complexities of war conditions are restored to a more normal state, numbers of sportsmen will seek your State as a recreation ground for hunting."
"It is with the greatest pleasure and admiration that I have learned that already you have recognized the dangers to the continued existence of the game animals that would be threatened by the unrestricted killing of sheep, and that you have placed a limit on the number which may be killed. Will you, therefore, permit me to suggest that you still further develop this policy to the extent of considering the game of your State as a real resource both for profit and for recreational value, and to achieve those ends you cause to have passed a complete game law, modeled after the best laws which long experience has proved to be most convenient for the conserving of game in this country. Such a law would encourage sportsmen going to Lower California by permitting a certain number of game animals to be killed - a number which would not result in decreasing the supply. The law should contain a provision requiring aliens to pay at least $50.00 U. S. currency to obtain a license to hunt in Lower California. Possibly you might think it wise that guides, who take hunting parties to the mountains should be licensed so that you can compel them to obey the law. Female animals should not be permitted to be killed, possibly an exception might be made in the case of deer. During the breeding seasons neither sheep nor antelope should be killed. Of course this law should be adapted to your
local conditions, and at any time the Governor should have the right further to restrict killing, if in his judgment the welfare of the game requires it.

"The making of a proper game law is a complex and somewhat difficult question and advantage should be taken of the results of past experience. I have been a student of game laws for years. Mr. E. W. Nelson, Chief of the Biological Survey, U. S. Department of Agriculture, had charge of the Federal control of the game of the United States and Alaska. He spent a year travelling the whole length of Lower California and crossing from coast to coast many times. He was specially studying the birds and animals and the topography. He has written a voluminous report which is now being published by the Smithsonian Institution in Washington.

"Will it be inconsistent for me to propose that Mr. Nelson and myself should draft a game law for your consideration and submit it to you for your guidance in establishing a final law to cover your territory? You would then have before you a model showing the result of the best development in game legislation in this country and you could properly adapt it by such changes as your knowledge of your conditions requires.

"But above all it should be recognized that hundreds of thousands of the best Americans are now interested in the conservation of wild life and that such a step on
your part would at once be widely published and would be recognized by these people. You would be considered as the most progressive of Mexican Governors and thus add to the admiration already given to your excellent administrative abilities.

"It is most difficult for the majority of people among Mexicans and Americans to understand and sympathize with the others' point of view, with the different customs and ideals, manners and ways of living. Each has behind them a different history and inheritance which have moulded them. But in the field of art, literature and recreation they do understand each other and any step taken by either which causes sympathy in the fields of aesthetic activities assists greatly in binding the friendship of two alien nations, because it involves the tastes which are ever mutual between the two.

"My suggestion of your establishing such a game law is made owing to my respect for you, and in the hope that aside from the material advantages it will also result in improving the relations between our nations.

"Believe me very faithfully yours,
C. Sheldon"
Mexicali, March 22, 1919

Charles Sheldon, Esq.,
Office of Naval Intelligence,
Washington, D. C.

My dear Sir:

I thank you very sincerely for your esteemed favor of the 26th ult., as well as for your valuable cooperation with my good friend, Mr. Hutchinson, in the satisfactory solving of all the questions that have arisen between this District and the American authorities. I am greatly obliged for the good words you are kindly addressing me, and for your endorsement of my administration. Your applause, although not well-deserved, is flattering to me.

Regulations have been issued and are in force here to restrict hunting and prevent the wanton destruction of wild life. The shooting season closes the last day of February and reopens the first of September. Moreover, the killing of wild mountain sheep, of white heron, and of other rare species is absolutely forbidden.

It is only reasonable to presume that our game rulings leave room for convenient alterations and improvements, and your enlightened suggestions on this important subject will be cheerfully welcomed by this Government.

Believe me, dear Mr. Sheldon,

Very truly yours,

E. Cantu
Before World War II in the late 1930's the Audubon Society sponsored a fellowship for a Mr. Nichols to make a study of the status of the desert sheep. The club made a financial contribution to this study. Nichols worked under the supervision of Dr. Vorhees of the University of Arizona. His report proved a contribution to our knowledge of the status of sheep in the southwest.

Just after World War II a crisis occurred in the status of Dall sheep in Mt. McKinley National Park. From an estimated herd of 10,000 sheep the numbers had dropped to 500. The Fish and Wildlife Service assigned Dr. Adolph Murie to work for a winter for the Park Service in Alaska to make a study on the ground of the factors causing sheep decline. Murie transferred to the Park Service and continued his studies through several seasons. His first report entitled The Wolves of Mt. McKinley was published by the Park Service and was subsequently followed by a number of mimeographed reports concerning the sheep population.

Coincidental with the fall in sheep population there had been an increase in wolves throughout the north. Mt. McKinley National Park was no exception. It was to be expected that many Alaskans as well as visiting sportsmen attributed the sheep decline to wolf predation. Many sportsmen and some conservation agencies were sincere in their conviction that the wolf was entirely responsible for the population fall of the sheep. These people felt the Park
Service was derelict in its duty in not immediately carrying out drastic wolf control in the park. Unfortunately, the controversy reduced itself to more of an emotional fight than anything else. Few who were deeply concerned with the status of the Dall sheep could view the situation dispassionately.

The Park Service took the stand that control would not be carried out until Murie had conducted his study and analyzed the limiting factors in the sheep populations. The obvious factor to outsiders is always the predator, but there are few cases where the predator is the most important factor as the coyote apparently can be in the survival of antelope fawns. Furthermore, the Park Service has maintained the principle that the parks should provide haven for our large predators as well as the ungulates.

The results of Murie's study indicated that the protected sheep herds had increased to around 10,000 before 1932. These sheep compete with each other for winter food by seeking the windswept summits where grass is available. The first disastrous winter occurred in 1932, and competition for food drove some sheep to lower altitudes where many starved and some were vulnerable to wolf predation. This winter was followed by others of heavy snows. Murie picked up over 800 sheep skulls and found the great majority of the victims were lambs or old animals.

It was the old story of an ungulate population increasing
in excess of its available winter food supply. The high population and the heavy winters appeared more important limiting factors than wolves.

During and just following Murie's study proponents of wolf control prepared a bill which, if passed, would force the Park Service to control wolves in Mt. McKinley. The Boone and Crockett Club voted against supporting this bill at the annual meeting in 1946, adhering to a long established policy of making its decisions on the basis of biological facts uncovered by Murie. Since several members of the club still held the honest conviction that wolves were to blame, the club appointed a wolf committee and appropriated $500 to send Dr. Harold J. Anthony to Alaska to investigate the wolf problem on the ground. His observations largely supported Murie's findings. Because of the threat of the bill, limited wolf control was finally practised by the Park Service but very few wolves were killed.

Since the wolf controversy the sheep have steadily increased so that now the future of the herds seems safe.

The most recent activity of the club in behalf of mountain sheep was the initiation of a project to reintroduce desert sheep in a favorable range in Texas. In 1951 the club sent Dr. Olaus J. Murie to Big Bend National Park to investigate possible areas in the park for restocking. His report was favorable.

In the early spring of 1953 Richard Borden, chairman of
the club's Conservation Committee, Dr. Clarence Cottam of the Fish and Wildlife Service, C. R. Gutermuth of the Wildlife Management Institute, and representatives of the Texas Fish and Game Dept., made a trip to Big Bend National Park to examine possible release sites. Although an ideal site was found in Big Bend, the Park Service decided it would be against their policy to permit local predator control which would be advisable in getting a herd of sheep started.

An alternate site in the Black Gap area outside the park was agreed upon. This project is under way as this goes to press. It is an expensive operation and had to be arranged on a cooperative basis. The club Conservation Committee and Gutermuth of the Boone and Crockett Club were wholly responsible for initiating this project. The cooperating agencies are the Boone and Crockett Club, Arizona Game and Fish Commission, Texas Game and Fish Commission, the Fish and Wildlife Service and Wildlife Management Institute. In September, 1954, an agreement outlining this operation was drawn up and signed by the cooperators.*

As of 1954 there were estimated to be 19,332 bighorns in the United States and a legal kill of 177, mostly in Colorado and Wyoming.

*See Appendix D.
Mountain Goats

From 1920 to 1923 the club was very active in a plan to stock Admiralty Island with mountain goats. Since the Alaskans were very interested in the project, the club raised money and made several attempts to get goats on the island. One of the club's main objectives actually was to ingratiate itself with the Alaskans. This finally fell through in 1923 when the individual selected by the Biological Survey to capture and transplant goats was unsuccessful.

Since that time goats have been established on Baranof Island. Nelson wrote Grinnell on March 3, 1924 that the legislature of Alaska had appropriated $10,000 to stock certain islands in southeastern Alaska with large game. As a result, in January ten Sitka black-tailed deer were planted on Montague Island and others were captured to place at Kachemak Bay on the Kenai Peninsula. During January five goats - three females and two males - were liberated on Baranof Island, near Sitka.

Musk-ox

In a letter from Sheldon to Grinnell dated January 15, 1919 the former commented as follows on musk-ox.

"Stefanssen and Burnham were here with the proposal to stock Alaska with musk oxen. This matter had previously been taken up with Riggs, Nelson and myself, but Stefanssen has brought here a much broader point of view on the whole matter, and has given it a real start."
If it should prove practical, I hope that the Boone and Crockett Club will stand behind it and promote it."

No further history on this proposal was found in the records but it is of interest that in 1930 a herd of musk-oxen from Greenland was established on Nunivak Island in Alaska and has slowly increased to about 75 animals.

**Key Deer**

One of the most recent activities of the club in behalf of big game species concerned the most diminutive species of white-tailed deer on the continent, the unique species from the Florida Keys. Formerly abundant, in 1952 the species was reduced to an estimated 54 individuals, most of which were confined to Great Pine Key. Illegal killing of the deer had reduced the population to a point where they were threatened with extinction. There was immediate need for effective patrolling of the area and the club contributed $5,000 to hire Mr. Watson who was well qualified to act as warden for the area. The money was turned over to the Fish and Wildlife Service. This was the case of an emergency when a species was immediately threatened. The following year this project was supported by the National Wildlife Federation. Federal funds now support warden service in the area, and the latest report indicates the Key deer have increased to over 90 individuals.

More refuge area is required to assure the survival of this small deer.
Other Species

In 1914 the club appointed a committee for the protection of walrus and other marine mammals. C. H. Townsend, a club member, was a member of the Advisory Board of the Fur Seal Service and was prominent in promoting the international treaty regulating the take of fur seals in the Pribilofs.

Members were not only interested in perpetuating the sport of wildlife, but recognized the basic importance of federal control of migratory birds. The club also was long aware that the future of waterfowl would eventually depend on the creation of many refuges. Legislation empowering the Biological Survey (later the Fish and Wildlife Service) to recommend the appropriation of funds to purchase suitable tracts of marsh land was a subject of much concern to the club and one which many club members fought valiantly for over the years.

In his history of 1916 Grinnell has this to say:

'In the year 1904, Hon. George Shiras, Jr., a member of the Club, introduced into the House of Representatives a bill whose purpose was to put migratory birds and fish under control of the United States Government. The protection of game and fish has been under the care of the local authorities of the different States, and the effort to transfer them from the charge of the States to the charge of the Federal Government, though by each
CHAPTER VII

WATERFOWL AND OTHER WILDLIFE LEGISLATION

Although the interest of the club in big game conservation was paramount, activities of the members included work in many fields of game conservation. Its interest in waterfowl has a long history. Members were not only interested in perpetuating the sport of wildfowling, but recognized the basic importance of federal control of migratory birds. The club also was long aware that the future of waterfowl would eventually depend on the creation of many refuges. Legislation empowering the Biological Survey (later the Fish and Wildlife Service) to recommend the appropriation of funds to purchase suitable tracts of marsh land was a subject of much concern to the club and one which many club members fought valiantly for over the years.

In his history of 1910 Grinnell has this to say:

"In the year 1904, Hon. George Shiras, 3d, a member of the Club, introduced into the House of Representatives a bill whose purpose was to put migratory birds and fish under control of the United States Government. The protection of game and fish has been under the care of the local authorities of the different States, and the effort to transfer them from the charge of the States to the charge of the Federal Government, though by most
people acknowledged to be desirable, was at first believed to be unconstitutional. The matter was discussed by a number of lawyers, among whom were Mr. Shiras, Judge D. C. Beaman and Hon. H. L. Stimson. These three gentlemen took three diverse views of the matter.

"In 1906, Mr. Shiras wrote a long brief on the subject, which was printed in that year in *Forest and Stream*. It shows much research. The Shiras bill never came to a vote, and in fact was introduced only for the purpose of bringing the matter before the public."

This was the first enunciation of the principle of federal control of migratory birds - a principle for which the club fought for many years until the final ratification of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.

The Shiras bill failed to pass but for the next nine years club members were prominent in agitating for the passage of this bill. Finally, the Weeks-McLean law was passed and became effective on March 4, 1913. This contained many of the essential features of the Shiras bill and gave the Department of Agriculture authority to make and enforce regulations which would give adequate protection to migratory birds.

According to Day (1949), the backers of the Weeks-McLean bill (which included many members of the Boone and Crockett Club) realized there was a lot of question about the
constitutionality of the bill. They realized also that opponents of the bill would attempt to bring a case testing its constitutionality to the Supreme Court.

At this point club members played a very important part unknown to many people. This was described by Sheldon in a letter to Nelson in 1915. This letter is reprinted in full in Chapter II. He described how Mr. Elihu Root was opposed to the Migratory Bird bill on the ground of his belief in its unconstitutionality. As a club member he sympathized with its objectives. According to Sheldon, "It was owing wholly to the influence that some of the club members brought to bear on him that his active opposition was withdrawn and that he appeased his conscience by introducing the resolution of international treaties which ... would preserve the constitutionality of the bill."

This is the resolution Day refers to as the one adopted by Congress requesting the President to initiate negotiations with other countries of the North American continent looking toward the establishment of international treaties.

Here was an instance where the club leaders decided that John Burnham and his American Game Protective Association was the logical organization to draft a treaty and push it through Congress. There are literally scores of letters on this matter and many hours of conferences between club members and Burnham and representatives of the Biological Survey. Club leaders lent Burnham all possible support.
As is well known, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act became law in 1918. The detailed provisions of this bill were largely drafted by club members, Burnham's organization, and the Biological Survey. It has been declared constitutional by the Supreme Court and has proved to be the most important Act in the preservation of waterfowl and the perpetuation of the sport of wildfowling.

There is abundant evidence in the club literature, in various letters and in the minutes of executive committee meetings that there was a keen awareness of the need for many waterfowl refuges to assure the future preservation of wildfowl.

Club members promoted the Public Shooting Grounds-Game Refuge Bill drawn up by E. W. Nelson (Chief of the Biological Survey) in 1921. This contained a provision for setting up federal duck refuges and contained a provision for a federal duck stamp. According to Pearson ( ), Nelson was the first one to conceive of a duck stamp. In the Public Shooting Grounds bill forty-five per cent of the proceeds of the stamp was to be used to buy refuge lands and the balance for enforcement. This bill was supported by the Boone and Crockett Club, Audubon Society, Isaac Walton League and the American Game Protective Association. In spite of this support it was bitterly attacked by some other sincere conservationists who termed it "legalized duck slaughter."

It was largely a case of misunderstanding on the part of its
The bill passed the House but failed of passage in the Senate.

According to Pearson (ibid.), the main provisions of this bill were included in a new bill pushed by Senator Norbeck entitled the "Migratory Bird Conservation Act."

Although it included some provisions for public shooting, the leaving out of the term "public shooting" (with its connotation which caused so much opposition) was a big factor in its successful passage of both houses in 1929. Pearson (ibid.) states it became law ten years after Nelson had started the Public Shooting Grounds bill.

As Gabrielson (1941) points out, the passing of the Norbeck-Andresen Migratory Bird Conservation Act ended the long battle for legal authority to purchase and establish a system of migratory bird refuges. This bill may be considered second in importance only to the Migratory Bird Act in preserving waterfowl. Along with the Upper Mississippi River Refuge Act (sponsored by the Isaac Walton League) and the Bear River Marsh Act, the program of refuge acquisition and development made rapid progress.

In 1928 when Paul G. Redington was chief of the Biological Survey, there was need of another federal game warden to enforce the Migratory Bird Treaty Act in Currituck Sound, North Carolina. No federal funds were available. The club donated the necessary funds to the Biological Survey to
Before the disastrous drought years of the 1930's there was much public clamor for drastic reduction of bag limits. The Boone and Crockett Club, the National Audubon Society, and other thinking groups were of the opinion that the importance of bag limits was much over-emphasized and that the perpetuation of waterfowl depended on many more fundamental factors. In 1926 the National Association of Audubon Societies published Bulletin No. 6 entitled FEDERAL POWER AND DUCK BAG LIMITS: FACTS. Although published anonymously, this was written by Sheldon. Some of the concluding statements which follow reflected the policy of Phillips, Grinnell and other club members interested in the waterfowl situation.

"SCIENTIFIC ADMINISTRATION OF DUCK CONSERVATION"

"We know that hordes of ducks migrating through sections of the country form separate groups more or less independent of, and unrelated to, each other."

"We do not yet know most of the facts. Before we can learn them different breeding areas must be visited for the purpose of banding ducks. Since sufficient funds for such purposes have not been appropriated to the Department of Agriculture, study in this direction has been limited.

"We do know, however, that the ducks of the Pacific Coast are a group wholly separate from that on the
Atlantic Coast. Conditions, population, habitats, widely differ in both regions.

"Therefore it is bad administration and unscientific to make uniform, blanket federal regulations covering two groups of ducks so widely separated. It would be as intelligent as to make the same regulation apply both to the deer of California and to those of New York. They should be regulated independently.

"When we know the facts and can determine the other independent migrating groups, each must receive special treatment.

"If our ducks are to be correctly administered, the importance of determining this problem is obvious.

"THE REAL DANGERS

"At present, ducks are probably at or beyond their food supply. Progressive drainage of marsh areas throughout the country and the lowering of the water level in some states have restricted their fall and winter habitats. They have been forced to concentrate in other areas and reduce their available food. These causes have led to disease and to the dangers of starvation and, in some cases, to forced change of feeding habits which have become a menace to crops.

"Oil polluted and alkali waters annually destroy great numbers. Disease has been increasing. Adverse conditions on their breeding grounds have been destructive to ducks."
How much we do not know, and can not know, until the 
breeding grounds shall be visited at the breeding time:
destruction of the food supply and methods of preserving 
and of increasing it; droughts; an international treaty 
with Mexico; more systematic study of natural enemies. 
There are other serious factors.

"This is the field that needs concentration and 
attention. In it, bag limits are insignificant factors. 
The agitation about them only diverts attention and work 
from being directed toward the vital problems.

"THE FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEM

"The maintenance of our wild fowl depends on correct 
administration, both scientific and practical, and on 
increased funds available for that purpose.

"Congress has given complete administrative power to 
the Department of Agriculture, acting through the 
Biological Survey. To solve this continental problem 
there can be no substitute for this Bureau.

"It has fulfilled its responsibilities and produced 
satisfactory results.

"The fundamental dangers that threaten our ducks are 
campaigns of irresponsible criticism directed against 
this Bureau and bills in Congress to curtail its 
necessary powers and cripple its administrative capacity.

"The fundamental necessity on which depends the 
future conservation of our ducks is the strengthening of
the administrative capacity of this Bureau by the
close confidence and active cooperation of the public,
including sympathetic constructive criticism, when
is believed to be necessary.

"If distrust of, and agitation against, this Bureau,
prompted by lack of knowledge of the facts and of the
problems, shall continue to the point where political
pressure will force the Department of Agriculture to
dominate its administrative methods on uninformed clamor,
rather than on scientific practical facts, our ducks
are doomed."

In early March, 1926, John C. Phillips, Sheldon, and a
"prominent member of a Cleveland duck club" held a
discussion about waterfowl at Sheldon's house in Washington,
D. C. In a letter to Grinnell dated March 14, 1926, Sheldon
wrote Grinnell as follows:

"We all believe that the situation in the country
calls for more than mere emergency measures. It calls
for a permanent organization reaching throughout the
country that will in the future be devoted to the
wildfowl interests of the country."

This conversation was the starting point of an
organization forgotten by many today but called the American
Wild Fowlers. In 1932 John C. Phillips privately published
a history of this organization, which initially was started
by Boone and Crockett Club members. Since this account
portrays well the policy of the club and contributes to the history of waterfowl conservation, it is reprinted in Appendix E in full. A brief summary of its aims and accomplishments is given below.

This group was organized largely as a result of the agitation against the Biological Survey outlined above. Badly crippled by lack of funds with which to conduct field research and banding, the Survey lacked facts to combat the campaign being waged against it. Nelson’s Game Refuge bill, already discussed, was defeated because of the public shooting ground clause.

As Phillips (1932) points out, "there seemed to be an immediate need of some organization which could unite sportsmen who were willing and able to help themselves as well as to help wildfowl. There was need of educating sportsmen to look at wildfowl problems in a broader and more national way."

A prominent board of directors was appointed and several meetings on organization followed. Boone and Crockett Club men were the instigators and leaders of the board of directors and executive committee.

Wildfowlers from duck clubs throughout the country were asked to join, but at that time it was decided not to have a large membership since it was felt a smaller dedicated group would be less unwieldy and more effective to meet the immediate wildfowl problems.
The principal objectives agreed upon were as follows:

1. To interest all persons or groups of persons in the intelligent preservation and increase of migratory wild fowl in order that legitimate sport and recreation may be insured for the present and future generations.

2. To cooperate with the United States Bureau of Biological Survey (Fish and Wildlife Service) and to resist legislative efforts designed to take away from that bureau or department to which it may be assigned the authority necessary to administer the migratory bird life of the nation.

3. To assist the Biological Survey in the defense of all its policies approved by the Executive Committee of the American Wild Fowlers, where its officials in public office may be barred or handicapped from participation.

4. To cooperate with all state game agencies in legislation consistent with the policies of the association.

5. To cooperate with the Bureau of Biological Survey in making a census of our wild fowl.

6. To show to the public that the active interest of sportsmen is the principal element in wildfowl conservation.

7. To assist in studying the life histories of wildfowl for the purpose of more intelligently administering and preserving them, and to help to remedy all conditions
adversely affecting them.

8. To cooperate with the constituted authorities to suppress the illegal traffic in game.

Mr. Nash Buckingham was employed as field secretary and on March 1, with Dr. Phillips, he opened an office in the Lenox Building on L Street in Washington.

Although the American Wild Fowlers organization as such operated only until 1931, a good start was made in carrying out some of its main objectives.

Annual funds were contributed to the Biological Survey for specific purposes. Fifteen hundred dollars a year was given for census work. Funds were provided for field studies and banding work.

In the spring of 1928 a field party under Mr. Archie Hull of Salt Lake City was sent to Alberta, Canada, to study the crow problem in its relation to breeding ducks.

The group financed banding trips of Mr. Frederick Lincoln of the Biological Survey to Louisiana, the Potomac River, and North Dakota.

Mr. Buckingham made a number of field trips with Biological Survey personnel with the idea of mapping a chain of wildfowl refuges in strategic areas.

Another major contribution of the American Wild Fowlers was the hiring of a number of special law enforcement agents to work under the supervision of the Biological Survey.

One of the major accomplishments stemming from this group
was their work in the field of federal legislation. The groundwork for drawing up a new game refuge bill was prepared by Mr. Buckingham. With the aid of several influential conservationists, among them Dr. Phillips, Dr. Pearson, Mr. Carlos Avery, Mr. Ray Holland and Mr. Seth Gordon, the National Committee on Wild Life Legislation was authorized at a meeting of the National Association of Game Commissioners in Seattle. This association played an influential part in the passage of the Norbeck-Andresen bill.

The enemies of the Biological Survey introduced the Haugen bill in Congress, which in essence would take bag limit and other federal regulations out of the hands of the Survey and into those of Congress - a basically unsound principle. The American Wild Fowlers organized opposition to this bill on a national scale and it was successfully defeated.

On May 13, 1931, the American Wild Fowlers as an organization came to an end. Several members felt the need of a larger organization which became known as "More Game Birds in America." This group stemmed from the American Wild Fowlers who comprised the initial membership of the new group. According to Albert M. Day (1949), this organization in turn fathered the present-day duck hunting group - Ducks Unlimited. It was inevitable that the policies adopted by the American Wild Fowlers underwent changes by the time Ducks Unlimited was formed. The latter organization has been on the right
track and has contributed much valuable work in the
restoration of the breeding grounds of the prairie ducks in
Canada. It may be said that the objectives of the early
American Wild Fowlers were predominantly drawn up to aid
financially and cooperate very closely with the Biological
Survey (Fish and Wildlife Service). It recognized this
federal agency as the legal administrative body responsible
for waterfowl. Ducks Unlimited has tended in the past to
work more as an independent agency and often has reported
optimistically on duck abundance. When its predictions on
duck numbers have differed from the Fish and Wildlife Service
a certain amount of dissension has followed.

An extremely prominent proponent of conservation
measures following 1930 was the late U. S. Senator Frederick
C. Walcott of Connecticut. The latter was an active Boone
and Crockett Club member. First elected to the club in 1905,
Walcott served on the executive committee for twelve years
between 1918 and 1938. He was elected president in 1940 and
served in this capacity until made honorary president in 1948.
Throughout this period, Walcott kept the club advised
of conservation work on Capitol Hill and often sought the
active aid of club members in legislation he was promoting
in the Senate.

Walcott's contribution to wildlife conservation, and
especially to waterfowl conservation, is well summarized as
follows by Albert Day (1949), former chief of the Fish and
Wildlife Service:
Much credit for the growth and evolution from the American Game Protective Association to the American Fish and Wildlife Institute and then to the Wildlife Management Institute goes to the late Honorable Frederick C. Walcott, who was elected in 1929. He had long been interested in the activities of the American Game Association and, upon his coming to the Senate, he carried his interest in wildlife conservation into that great body. He was instrumental in having the Senate Special Committee on the Conservation of Wildlife Resources organized and became its first chairman. As such, he aided in the passage of the Duck Stamp Bill. He also pressed for the passage of the first Coordination Act which decreed that the Bureau of Biological Survey and the Bureau of Fisheries should be consulted for advice on how fish and game would be affected by water impoundments which Federal construction agencies proposed to create.

Through the Boone and Crockett Club, Walcott was active in promoting many other important conservation legislative measures since the end of World War I.

Mr. J. N. ("Ding") Darling, former chief of the Biological Survey, initiated the now well-known Cooperative Wildlife Research Units. The Wildlife Management Institute was one of the original promoters of these units and has contributed to their financial support ever since. Set up at
land grant colleges to train students in the profession of wildlife management, the units are jointly supported by the Fish and Wildlife Service, state conservation departments, land grant universities and the Wildlife Management Institute. There are seventeen of these units, and they have supplied a reservoir of trained men in the field. The Boone and Crockett Club for years promoted the policy of game management by trained personnel as opposed to political appointees.

Following the establishment of the Cooperative Wildlife Research Units, Boone and Crockett Club personnel were active in promoting the passage of the Pittman-Robertson Act in 1938. This act earmarked the excise taxes of arms and ammunition sales to be used for game research and management. Administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service, several million dollars have become available for putting game management on a sound biological basis. The various states are apportioned a share on the basis of population and area. For every dollar spent, seventy-five cents comes from the excise tax contributed by the federal government and twenty-five cents must be appropriated by the states.

The Dingell-Johnson Act followed several years later and provides funds for fisheries research and management on the same basis.

These acts have been responsible for putting game and fish conservation on a sound basis of the type advocated by the Boone and Crockett Club.