



LIBRARIES

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

The pine cone : March, 1920. 1920

[s.l.]: New Mexico Game Protective Association, 1920

<https://digital.library.wisc.edu/1711.dl/G65AV6OBR2TSI8G>

<http://rightsstatements.org/vocab/InC/1.0/>

The copyright for all material in this collection is held by the Aldo Leopold Foundation. Written authorization from the Aldo Leopold Foundation is required prior to reproducing items in the collection for publication or exhibition.

For higher quality digital or print copies please contact the University of Wisconsin Digital Collections Center.

The libraries provide public access to a wide range of material, including online exhibits, digitized collections, archival finding aids, our catalog, online articles, and a growing range of materials in many media.

When possible, we provide rights information in catalog records, finding aids, and other metadata that accompanies collections or items. However, it is always the user's obligation to evaluate copyright and rights issues in light of their own use.

OUR PLATFORM

1. We stand for vigorous and impartial enforcement of the game and fish laws.
2. We stand for federal control of migratory birds and prohibition of *spring shooting*.
3. We stand for co-operation with stockmen in a vigorous campaign against *predatory animals*.
4. We stand for an adequate system of Game Refuges.
5. We stand for such an increase in game and fish as will furnish *legitimate sport for every citizen*.
6. We are opposed in general to the public propagation in New Mexico of foreign species as a substitute for *native American game*.
7. We represent 1,500 members, each and every one *pledged* to observe the letter of the law and the spirit of good sportsmanship.
8. We are not in politics.
9. We stand behind every warden who *does his duty*.
10. We offer \$50.00 reward for information leading to the arrest and conviction of any person killing antelope, mountainsheep or ptarmigan.

"The ways of outdoor life, the nobility of courage, the joy of beauty, the blessedness of enough, the glory of service, the power of kindness, the super-excellence of peace of mind, and the scorn of death—these were the things the Redman stood for. These were the sum of his faith."

ERNEST THOMPSON SETON.



As the cone scatters the seeds of the pine and fir tree, so may this little paper scatter the seeds of wisdom and understanding among men.

Six Rules For Sportsmen

1. *Be a Real Sportsman.* There is more honor in giving the game a square deal than in getting the limit.
2. *Make Sure It's a Buck.* If you can't see his horns—she hasn't got any.
3. *Help Enforce the Game Law.* Game and fish are public property and only a game-hog will take more than his fair and legal share. Violations should be reported to the nearest Deputy Warden, Forest Ranger, or Game Protective Association.
4. *Respect the Ranchman's Property.* He regards the man who leaves his gates open, cuts his fences, chouses his livestock, or shoots near dwellings, as an outlaw. Put yourself in his place.
5. *Be Careful With Your Campfire and Matches.* One tree will make a million matches; one match can burn a million trees.
6. *Leave a Clean Camp and a Clean Record.* Unburied garbage, crippled game, and broken laws, are poor monuments for a sportsman to leave behind him.

EXTERMINATION or REFORM

Drastic House-Cleaning Needed in Whole Theory and Practice of Game Management.

N. M. G. P. A. OFFERS PRACTICAL PLAN OF REFORM.

The New Mexico Game Protective Association proposes a revolution in the great science and art of game management. We propose it specifically for the State of New Mexico, but the basic principles involved are universal in their scope. These principles are simple in theory, practical in application, and perfectly in accord with the great ideas of conservation of our natural resources that have become current during the past twenty-five years. We are setting forth these principles at some length in this issue of the Pine Cone, in the belief that the game of this state and the game of the entire nation is facing a crisis. There is only one issue:

EXTERMINATION OR REFORM.

We believe that the conventional methods of game protection in vogue in New Mexico and pretty generally in every other state in the Union are inadequate and antiquated. The unregulated open season, the unlimited sale of licenses (with the consequent unlimited slaughter of game), the failure to provide and protect a minimum breeding stock, and the attempt at game regulation by the cumbrous process of statutory enactments by state legislatures instead of by discretionary authority lodged in competent and trustworthy public officials—these are the great vices that vitiate the whole theory and practice of game protection.

Either they must go or the game must go.

These may sound like broad statements, but we believe that these facts are generally applicable and that the program here offered is unassailable in principle.

The program involves three parts: the establishment of federal game refuges within the National Forests, and of state refuges elsewhere, the substitution of a flexible system of administrative regulation of game resources by a permanent state game commission in the place of the present system of inflexible legislative enactments combined with politically appointed and consequently short-term game wardens, and the adoption of the principle of quantitative regulation of kill.

I. GAME REFUGES: WHAT THEY ARE AND HOW THEY WORK.

A game refuge, in the real meaning of the term, is a small portion of a natural game range set aside and permanently protected from shooting, for the purpose of maintaining an unimpaired breeding-stock to replenish the surrounding hunting grounds. Every real game refuge must satisfy the following conditions:

- (1) It must be small in relation to the

game range; it is a museum of living specimens; whereas a game refuge produces game for hunting; it does not close up an entire game region, but simply acts as a reservoir that constantly overflows the surrounding region.

Take for example a mountain range fifty miles long and twenty miles wide, including foothills, with plains surrounding it on all sides. Mountain ranges of this type are numerous in New Mexico. A game refuge might close the entire range to hunting; whereas, under the game refuge plan,

There is now before Congress an admirable bill, which would authorize the President to create game refuges within the National Forests, with the consent of the Governor of the state in which the refuge is situated. This bill is known as the Nelson bill (S2182) and is printed in full in this issue.

This bill entirely meets the requirements of game refuges as set forth above. Moreover, it removes the only possible local objections to such refuges, in making their creation dependent on the approval of the Governor, and by guaranteeing that the refuges will not be locked up against the utilization of the range by livestock or their other resources.

IF YOU BELIEVE IN FEDERAL GAME REFUGES, write immediately to your Representative and Senators urging that this bill be reported out of Committee at once and brought up for passage.

STATE OR FEDERAL REFUGES?

Several members of Congress have objected to the passage of a National Game Refuge bill on the grounds that any extension of federal activity in game matters on the National Forests is an invasion of "states rights." Such objections seem wholly futile and academic. We are facing not a theory but a fact. The fact is that the Federal Government is the owner and manager of 150,000,000 acres of National Forests, and should take an intelligent and active interest in the production of game on its lands, the same as any other landowner. If it fails to do so, the state in which these Forests lie, and whose citizens depend on these Forests for recreation, will be the first to suffer by its neglect. If a private landowner establishes a refuge on his lands, nobody construes his action as a subtle attack on the "state's rights." Why should not the Federal Government do at least as much as any other intelligent landowner, if it is for the public interest? As a matter of fact, every federal refuge bill so far proposed actually recognizes, by implication, the states' undisputed title to the game, and the effort to obstruct the passage of such bills on the grounds of "states' rights" is merely an effort to obscure the issue in a cloud of political dust.

Another much more pertinent objection which has been advanced against the proposed federal refuge system is that the states themselves can establish refuges on the National Forests, and that federal action is therefore unnecessary. As a matter of fact, most of the western states have al-

(Continued on page 2.)

Here is the Program of Game Management for New Mexico

I.

Pass the Nelson Game Refuge Bill, now before Congress, which will allow the establishment of Federal game refuges on the National Forests. This means small refuges to provide an overflow of game onto the surrounding hunting grounds. They will not interfere with grazing or other uses of the Forests.

II.

Get the next Legislature to reorganize the State Game Department, by establishing a competent commission, which will have authority to hire State Game Warden, to close seasons on game when and where needed, to establish state refuges, and to exercise all other powers necessary to the efficient management of game.

III.

Adopt the principle of quantitative regulation of kill. Limit the number of big game animals of any species to be lawfully killed each year, in each district, by limiting the number of hunting permits to be sold.

READ ALL ABOUT IT IN THIS ISSUE.

game range of which it is a part. Only in very rare cases should a refuge cover an entire game range.

- (2) It must leave hunting grounds outside. No game refuge system will succeed unless it meets the popular demand for hunting.

The game refuge is very different from the game preserve. Game preserves are all right in their place. It is a fine thing to have great game regions like the Yellowstone and Grand Canyon National Parks, to be left forever as they came from the hand of nature; where wild animals can increase and roam at will and even regain the trust for man that they once had. But the game preserve is not a game refuge. It closes hunting throughout an entire re-

gion; it is a museum of living specimens; whereas a game refuge produces game for hunting; it does not close up an entire game region, but simply acts as a reservoir that constantly overflows the surrounding region. Take for example a mountain range fifty miles long and twenty miles wide, including foothills, with plains surrounding it on all sides. Mountain ranges of this type are numerous in New Mexico. A game refuge might close the entire range to hunting; whereas, under the game refuge plan,

Everybody knows that wild animals quickly learn what a refuge is, and quickly avail themselves of its protection. Game refuges will accomplish the most immediately necessary thing in the whole range of game protection problems; they will furnish inviolable sanctuaries where at least a nucleus of game animals can survive and breed. It will be shown elsewhere that the system of closed seasons will never accomplish this result.

The Pine Cone

A quarterly paper devoted to the cause of
Wild Life Conservation.

Published at Albuquerque, N. M., by
Circulation 5,000 Copies

OFFICIAL BULLETIN OF THE NEW MEX-
ICO GAME PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION.

(Application pending for entry as second class
postal matter.)

THE NEW MEXICO GAME PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION

Hugh L. Hodge, President Silver City
C. A. Whited, First Vice-President Raton
C. G. Mardorf, Treasurer Santa Fe
Aldo Leopold, Secretary Albuquerque
Editors
Pine Cone
Ward Shepard Albuquerque
Aldo Leopold
E. R. Wright, Counsel Santa Fe

LOCAL ASSOCIATIONS.

Sportsmen's Association of Southwestern New
Mexico, Silver City, N. M.

Hugh L. Hodge, President R. T. Kellogg, Secretary
Harry Booth, Vice-President C. C. Metcalf, Secretary

Santa Fe Game Protective Association.
F. R. Stevenson, President C. G. Mardorf, Treasurer
Frank Owen, Vice-President A. J. Fisher, Secretary

Albuquerque Game Protective Association.
M. Nash, President Hugh Cassidy, Secretary
Kenneth Baldridge, Vice-President Ross Merritt, Treasurer

Carlsbad Game Protective Association.
Delbert Jackson, President John W. Armstrong, Sec'y & Treas.

Colfax Co. Game Protective Association.
C. A. Whited, President H. T. Morrow, Secretary

Magdalena Game Protective and Sportsmen's
Association.
Dr. M. McCreary, President T. C. Turk, Secretary
Oscar Redemann, Vice-President Allen Falconer, Treasurer
Fred E. Butler, Counsellor.

Roswell Game Protective Association.
H. P. Saunders, President.

Taos Game and Fish Protective Association.
H. R. Leatherman, President Dr. Fred Muller, Secretary
C. R. Dwire, Vice-President Ralph Myers, Treasurer

Las Cruces Game Protective Association.
W. H. Sutherland, President.

McKinley Co. Game Protective Association.
T. F. Smalling, President.

Carriazo Game Protective Association.
E. L. Medler, President.

Chama Rod and Gun Club.
Roy Hall, President A. E. Carr, Secretary

El Paso Game Protective Association.
(Affiliated.)
W. H. Shelton, President Alves Dixon, Secretary

STATE OR FEDERAL REFUGES?

(Continued from page 1.)

ready done this to some extent. What is
the answer to this argument?

Let it be said at the outset that the G.
P. A. cares not a whit who establishes
refuges on the National Forests, provided
only it be done quickly and done right.
It is also absolutely essential that the
refuges be patrolled and enforced after es-
tablishment, but this does not really enter
into the argument, since the Forest
Rangers and the State's Deputy Game
Wardens must in any event join forces to
perform this function efficiently. They are
already doing this where state refuges
have been established.

The real question is: do state refuges
"fill the bill" on the National Forests?
We need not theorize on this question; the
answer can be given from experience. The
answer is that in actual practice, state
refuges in the West have proven satisfac-
tory only in those states having well-de-
veloped, well-financed, non-political game
departments. In those states where the
game wardenships are still political ap-
pointments (this, unfortunately, means
most of the West) state refuges have not
"filled the bill." The reasons have been
as follows:

- (1) Poorly selected locations, often
representing the idea of some in-
dividual Legislator, or the desire
of some influential stockman to
keep hunters off his range.
- (2) No system in selecting locations.
Each refuge is handled piecemeal,
without reference to the rest.

- (3) No definite boundaries. Some-
times no boundaries at all are
given, the area being designated
simply as a certain mountain range.
- (4) Boundaries constantly changed.
Where locations are poorly selected
in the first place, stability can
hardly be hoped for.
- (5) No money for patrol. License
money has even been taken away
from state game departments and
devoted to other purposes.
- (6) Refuges too large and too few.
The "overflow" radius varies with
the locality and requires the judg-
ment of experienced men on the
ground.
- (7) Special hunting concessions grant-
ed as political favors. Happily
this has been rare, but the demoral-
izing effect on public sentiment is
very great.

It seems unnecessary to elaborate the
above points. They are weaknesses in-
herent in any political administration of
scientific work. Suffice it to say that in
some cases these "political" refuges bid
fair to discredit the whole refuge idea. In
one western state, for instance, one well-
intentioned legislator wanted to make a
"game refuge" of a whole county, an
area twice the size of Rhode Island! Most
of Arizona's refuges include whole isolated
ranges of mountains, thus absolutely pre-
venting any overflow value. Such contor-
tions of the game refuge idea are really
not refuges at all, but merely huge game
preserves. They serve to protect the game
within their borders to the extent that they
are enforced, but they also serve to con-
centrate the hunting on the mountain
ranges remaining open, and where these
open areas are near cities they soon become
cleaned of all game. Thus the net benefit
is about zero. It may as well be said here
and now that no real refuge cuts off all
the hunting in any hunting ground, but
rather closes a selected fraction of it *as*
to prevent the cleaning out of the breeding
stock. In short, *it puts the spigot in the
side instead of the bottom of the barrel.*

It should be distinctly understood that
the foregoing conclusions apply only to the
big game problem of the National Forests.
There is little similarity between this prob-
lem and any other. State refuges elsewhere
are not only desirable but necessary. It
should also be understood that the forego-
ing conclusions are not a criticism of any
particular state or state game department.
Many "political" wardens are good men,
but they are working with a millstone
around their necks. What with political
pressure, legislative interference, unstable
tenure of office, and lack of funds, it is
small wonder that good results are not ob-
tained.

GAME REFUGES VS. CLOSED SEASONS.

The typical, conventional method of
protecting a depleted species—a method
used in this state and throughout the United
States—is the closed season, varying
from two years to an indefinite period.

The closed season as a protective device
has several grave defects:

- (1) *It is clumsy*, being usually appli-
cable to the whole state, whereas a given
species may need drastic protection only in
certain portions of its range. Legislatures
object to passing "sectional" laws, impos-
ing restrictions in certain regions and not
in others.
- (2) *It comes usually too late*: Usually
only genuine public alarm will cause a
legislature to shut off free hunting. When
a species is depleted beyond a certain mini-
mum level of safety, it is liable to extermi-
nation for the reason that its natural
enemies are far out of proportion to its
lowered ability to resist them. Closed sea-
sons rarely come before this minimum
level of safety has been reached and passed.
- (3) *Long closed seasons increase poach-
ing*: The lawless element will more readily
acquiesce in a reasonable system of game
refuges than in a general closed season.

(4) *The closed season is sporadic in ap-
plication*: It lacks the continuity of effect
of the permanent game refuge. As soon as
the closed season is removed, the high-
power rifle, plus the automobile, reduces
the species to its former precarious state,
and the process must be started all over
again. It is as if a livestock grower should,
say every five years, sell all his increase
and two-thirds of his breeding-stock; and
then painfully, through five lean years, at-
tempt to build his breeding stock up to
normal.

These arguments must not be taken as
a condemnation of the closed season. In
truth, the closed season, in the absence of
better methods of protection, has been a
God-send to the game. We maintain mere-
ly that the closed season is not the best and
most logical method of protection. Under
any system of game management, the use
of the closed season will be necessary; but
that it can be made vastly more flexible
and useful will be shown elsewhere (see
"Game Regulation vs. Game Legislation").

Game refuges will cure many of the de-
fects inherent in the closed season. They
will be permanent in application and effect;
they will gain the respect of everyone ex-
cept the irreconcilable poacher, for the rea-
son that they are based on the sound prin-
ciple of utilizing game resources to the
fullest extent compatible with keeping an
unimpaired breeding-stock. Anyone who
does not subscribe to this principle is a
game-hog by instinct. But even with game
refuges, closed seasons will still be needed
on various species—such as the antelope
and the mountain-sheep in New Mexico—
so far have these species sunk beyond the
power of recovery by any ordinary means,
if at all.

REFUGES AND BUCK SHORTAGE.

One of the important problems which
will find their solution in a proper Refuge
System is the problem of buck shortage.

Most states, including New Mexico, have
buck laws which allow the killing of deer
with horns only. This has resulted in a
noticeable shortage of bucks in many local-
ities. Hunters tell of seeing dozens of
does, but not a single pair of creditable
horns. It is not unlikely that many does
are barren through lack of males. If this
is the case, the productive capacity of even
our miserable remnant of deer is being
seriously reduced. There is moreover, dan-
ger of actually running down the physical
qualities of our breeding stocks through
breeding does by immature males. This
physical deterioration has actually happen-
ed in some European forests where too
many prime stags have been killed off for
many years.

The problem of buck shortages is not a
new one. It has been up before in other
states and as often as it arises some ill-ad-
vised person begins to advocate an open
season on does. It came up in New York
state last year, and the buck law was ac-
tually repealed. Result: hunting acci-
dents vastly increased, does and fawns
slaughtered in great numbers, and just as
many bucks killed as usual. We need not
theorize about repealing buck laws—ex-
perience has proven again and again that
such a remedy is worse than the disease it
seeks to cure.

When a man is trying to build up a
herd of cattle and has a shortage of bulls,
what does he do?—kill off cows? Decided-
ly not. He devises means to get more bulls.
Just so in building up our deer supply.
We must get more bucks. How is this to
be done?

The G. P. A. submits that GAME REF-
UGES offer a perfectly practical way of
getting more bucks. Fawns are naturally
born and raised, male and female, about
equally. But it is well known that deer
are polygamous, and that the larger,
stronger bucks appropriate the does. There-
fore, in a state of nature, where there are
as many bucks as does, and where the males
are not artificially reduced, there is a con-
stant excess of probably seventy-five per
cent of non-breeding males.

Now a Game Refuge is, with respect to
this problem, in a state of nature, and will
constantly produce excess bucks. The
herd bucks and their does will naturally
appropriate the protected Refuge range,
and crowd the excess bucks into the sur-
rounding country, where they will not only
furnish hunting, but tend to breed the
barren does that exist there. In other
words, Refuges will constantly and auto-
matically tend to correct the buck-shortage.
They are the logical and necessary means
of correcting the one weakness of the
"Buck-law" system.

STATE GAME REFUGES FOR DUCKS AND QUAIL.

Nothing will hold ducks in the country
like a few scattered areas where they can
rest and feed in peace. There is many a
good ducking ground where the shooting
would be a whole lot better if a part of the
area were closed to shooting at all times.
It is quite possible to have a plentiful duck
supply in the country at large, and no duck
shooting, because the birds have all been
"bombarded out" and have moved else-
where.

Nothing will keep up the supply of quail
like a few scattered areas, containing brush
cover and feed, where no shooting is allow-
ed. It is impossible to clean out the seed
stock where such a closed area or refuge is
nearby. By taking the further precaution
of keeping such refuges clean of wild house
cats and sharp-shinned hawks, plentifully
stocked with thorny brush, and supplied
with water and possibly feed in snowy
weather, the quail supply of the surround-
ing country would be nearly a sure thing.

Why should not the state establish a sys-
tem of duck and quail refuges? Many a
landowner would be glad to give the state
a long lease on waste land for such pur-
poses, and eventually the state might be
able to buy and own them. Nothing would
pay better dividends in improved shooting
than a thousand small refuges scattered
over the valleys and foothills of New Mexi-
co.

While the worst need for game refuges
is for big game in the mountains, the prin-
ciple is equally applicable to small game
everywhere. While the G. P. A. believes
that big game refuges should be established
by the federal government because they
will be on government land, we believe that
duck and quail refuges should be establish-
ed by the state and by private landowners.

II. GAME REGULATION VS. GAME LEGISLATION.

This question involves some fundamental
theories in the science of government. They
can be best illustrated by examples. The
game laws of New Mexico and of most
other states minutely prescribe the condi-
tions under which game can be hunted, fix
open and closed season, exactly limit the
powers of the State Game Warden, and in
general seek by statute to handle the whole
business of game protection as a function
of the legislative branch of the government.
This is government by statute.

There is another kind of government—
government by administrative regulation
promulgated by a responsible administra-
tive official, under broad discretionary
powers conferred by a basic statute. Under
such a system, the legislature defines the
purpose of the statute in broad terms, and
authorizes a designated administrative of-
ficial to make necessary rules and regula-
tions for putting that purpose into effect.
A striking development in this type of gov-
ernment in America is to be found in the
Federal Migratory bird regulations, promul-
gated by the Secretary of Agriculture.
Migratory birds are protected under a
treaty entered into between the United
States and Canada. To give effect to this
treaty, Congress passed an act authorizing
the Secretary of Agriculture "to determine
when, to what extent, if at all, and by what
means, it is compatible with the terms of
the convention to allow hunting, taking,
capturing, killing, sale, purchase, ship-

A CALL TO ARMS

ment, transportation, carriage, or export of any such bird, or any part, nest, or egg thereof, and to adopt suitable regulations permitting and governing the same, which regulations shall become effective when approved by the President." As everybody knows, the Secretary of Agriculture, with the approval of the President, has control over every essential feature of protecting migratory birds. Imagine Congress attempting to regulate, by statute, the open seasons, closed seasons, bag limits, etc., of dozens of species scattered from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The thing is inconceivable. Yet, on a smaller scale, we find in the State Game Department exactly that inflexible and impossible system.

How can we destroy that inflexibility? The statute creating the State Department of Health has pointed the way. Here is a Commission to which the state legislature has delegated extensive authority in regulating public health—such as making rules for the sanitary handling of milk, closing public meetings in time of epidemic, etc. Suppose, during the influenza epidemic, we had had to wait for a meeting of the legislature before closing public meetings. Yet that is no more illogical than waiting for a legislative enactment to close the season on a species immediately threatened with extermination. Take quail, for example; they suffered heavy losses in the cold winter of 1918-19 in the northern half of this state. Yet legally, absolutely nothing can be done to protect them before the legislature meets in 1921. Meanwhile, two open seasons will have elapsed, and they will have become still more depleted.

Suppose there are fifty deer left in the San Mateo Mountains, and suppose there ought to be a thousand. There are now two possible ways to protect them; get the legislature to close the season on deer in that region; or close the deer season throughout the state. The first way would necessitate sectional legislation—a difficult thing to put through. The second would be obviously wasteful and clumsy as a means of protecting deer in merely one locality. What actually happens? No special protection whatsoever is given to the deer in the San Mateos, and they keep on the broad and rosy path to extermination.

What should happen? The State Game Department should have the power to close the season on the deer in the San Mateos, or anywhere else they are nearing extinction.

What is urgently and immediately needed in New Mexico is a new basic law, creating a permanent game commission vested with wide discretionary powers. The State Game Department is tied hand and foot; its functions are rigidly limited to selling licenses and prosecuting violations; it has not a vestige of authority in the real science of game management; it is a combination of clerical and police functions. It needs the breath of life, the urge of vitality, the power to grow that comes only through the exercise of real authority.

Such powers should not be delegated indiscriminately, and it is probably the fear of abuse of delegated power that makes legislators hesitate to grant it. The remedy is easy to find: safeguard the exercise of such authority by placing it in safe hands. For instance, a commission of three appointed by the Governor, one to be selected from the faculty of the University of New Mexico, one from the staff of the New Mexico College of Agriculture and Mechanical Arts, and a third appointed at large, all serving without pay, would insure a high quality of administration and continuity of administration. Large authority could safely be entrusted to such hands. The commission should appoint the State Game Warden, and act as a Board of Directors in guiding his activities.

No less needful than vitality and authority is continuity of policy and administration. In the federal departments—e. g. the Department of Agriculture—this is secured by placing all the bureau chiefs on a permanent civil service footing. Only the head of the Department and his immediate assistants change with a change of

If we are ever to have Federal Game Refuges, now is the time for all sportsmen and game conservationists to shake off their lethargy and their personal differences, and to support a definite plan. Such a plan is embodied in the game refuge bill here quoted, which was introduced by Senator Knute Nelson.

IF

you believe in game protection and game propagation, if you want any game left for your sons to hunt, write to your Senators requesting their support of the Nelson Game Refuge Bill (known as S-2182) and write to the Committee on Forest Reservations and Protection of Game, U. S. Senate, Washington, D. C., urging them to report this bill out of Committee. There is no chance of this bill passing except by the undivided support of all sportsmen and all game protective organizations.

"A BILL"

"To establish game sanctuaries in national forests, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purpose of providing breeding places for game animals on lands in the national forests not chiefly suitable for agriculture the President of the United States is hereby authorized, upon recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture and with the approval of the Governors of the States in which the respective national forests are located, to establish, by public proclamation, certain specified areas within said forests as game sanctuaries or refuges, which shall be devoted to the increase of game of all kinds naturally adapted thereto, but it is not intended that the lands included in such game sanctuaries or refuges shall cease to be part of the national forests wherein they are located, and the establishment of such game sanctuaries or refuges shall not prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from allowing grazing on these areas of cattle, sheep, and other domestic animals or allowing other uses thereof under and in conformity with the laws and rules and regulations applicable to the national forests, so far as such use may be consistent with the purposes for which such game sanctuaries or refuges are authorized to be established.

Sec. 2. That when such game sanctuaries or refuges have been established, as provided in section 1 of this Act, hunting, pursuing, poisoning, killing, or capturing by trapping, netting, or any other means, or attempting to hunt, pursue, kill, or capture any wild animals or birds or fish for any purpose whatever upon the lands of the United States within the limits of said game sanctuaries or refuges shall be unlawful except as hereinafter provided, and any person violating any provision of this Act or any of the rules and regulations made under the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and shall upon conviction in any United States court be fined in a sum not exceeding \$500, or be imprisoned for a period not exceeding six months, or shall suffer both fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.

Sec. 3. That the Secretary of Agriculture shall execute the provisions of this Act, and he is hereby authorized to make all needful rules and regulations for the administration of such game sanctuaries or refuges in accordance with the purpose of this Act, including regulations under which fishing not in contravention of State laws, and hunting, capturing, or killing predatory animals, such as wolves, coyotes, foxes, pumas, and other species destructive to live stock or wild life may be permitted within the limits of said game sanctuaries or refuges.

Sec. 4. That the Secretary of Agriculture shall cause the boundaries of all game sanctuaries or refuges established under the provisions of this Act to be suitably marked where necessary and notices to be posted showing the location thereof and warning the public that hunting game animals and birds is prohibited therein, and that hunting, capturing, or killing predatory animals, and fishing is permitted only under rules and regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Sec. 5. That it is the purpose of this Act to provide breeding places for large wild animals such as deer, elk, mountain sheep, and other species which may be made to produce an increased food supply by breeding under natural conditions and spreading over adjacent territory whereon they may be hunted in accordance with State laws; to establish sanctuaries of medium size rather than large preserves; and whenever possible to establish chains of sanctuaries which in turn will restore wild game animals to intervening territory; but it is not the purpose to authorize the establishment of such game sanctuaries or refuges as will embrace all the hunting grounds of any given region.

administration. As the state has never adopted the "merit" system, by which, in the federal government, the great majority of employees hold their jobs permanently, the state departments are usually completely overthrown at every change of administration. New men take up new and unfamiliar tasks; and the work of their predecessors, however good, may largely be lost.

A technical subject like game management requires continuity of administration. It can be secured by a commission such as that suggested above. The same end is secured in the new State Department of Health by the principle of overlapping membership, by which certain members hold over from one administration to the next.

There is nothing new or radical in these suggested changes of administration. They embody principles of government that have been thoroughly tried and, because of their success, are being rapidly extended. The management of the great game resources of New Mexico will make a mighty forward stride if these principles are put into effect.

III. QUANTITATIVE REGULATION OF KILL.

As pointed out above, the unlimited sale of big game hunting licenses is unsound, illogical, and destructive. It means that there is absolutely no relation between the amount of game killed and the amount of game in the state. This vice becomes ever worse. Game is steadily decreasing while the number of hunters is steadily growing, the means of reaching the game (automobiles and good roads) are constantly increasing, and weapons and ammunition are becoming more and more deadly. It is perfectly obvious that this system means only one thing—total extermination.

The only answer is quantitative regulation of the annual kill of big game. This means that on a given game range, a predetermined number of animals of each species will be killed each year. Permits should be sold for the killing of this number, and no more, based on a careful estimate of the kill the species can stand without depletion. To insure fairness to all, permits should be issued by lottery, at a fair price. This will insure a square deal and a fair chance to every citizen.

The quantitative regulation of kill presupposes three things:

- (1) A permanent game policy, carried out by a permanent organization.
- (2) Full discretionary power lodged in the organization to determine and regulate the amount of game to be killed each year in each game range.
- (3) A big game census.

The first two points have already been fully discussed elsewhere in this issue.

Naturally, if you are going to regulate the annual kill, it is necessary to have a big game census. One of the functions of the State Game Department, in cooperation with the U. S. Biological Survey and the U. S. Forest Service, should be to make a careful survey of the game resources of the State, for each game range. This would require careful field work, supplemented by reports of hunters. These hunters' reports could easily be secured by requiring applicants to fill out a form in connection with license-applications, giving the number of game animals killed during the previous season and the place where they were killed.

The quantitative regulation of kill can not satisfactorily be applied to small game, such as quail, grouse, etc. These species can be properly regulated by adjusting the bag limits when necessary, by creating refuges, and by authorizing the State Game Commission to apply regional closed seasons in case of need.

The quantitative regulation of kill is the very basis of the whole science of game management. Game refuges, under this system, will be an auxiliary, providing a factor of safety to offset errors in the game

census or errors in game management. Game refuges and quantitative regulation—without these, game protection will never adequately protect. It will, at best, merely stall off the inevitable day. Here in the Southwest, the buffalo and the elk have gone, the antelope and the mountain sheep are making a last desperate stand, the deer and the wild turkey are on the downward path. Let us take heed before it is too late.

HOW ABOUT THE AUTOMATIC?

Is the automatic shotgun a sportsman-like weapon? Is it more destructive to game than other shotguns? Should its use be prohibited by law? Ever since the first automatic shotguns were put on the market, these questions have been warmly debated by thinking sportsmen all over the country.

This "automatic question" has never stirred up much excitement in New Mexico, possibly for the reason that a comparatively small percentage of our sportsmen are using automatic guns. It is important, however, that an early decision be reached. If we are going to prohibit automatic shotguns, we should do so before too many gunners have invested in them. For the purpose of stimulating serious thought on the question and ascertaining the consensus of opinion, the Pine Cone proposes to open its columns to a thorough discussion of both sides of the question.

In other states where the question has been up, the pump gun has been commonly classed with the automatic. While the Pine Cone is open to conviction on the question of pumps, it is frankly our opinion that there is no comparison between the two. What the pump gains over the double barrel in having more than two shots, it loses through the slowness of "follow-up." As far as the first two shots are concerned, the ordinary double barrel is the deadlier weapon. There may be a very few men who can pump with such rapidity and precision that the pump gun becomes practically an automatic in their hands. But such men are very scarce. Unless some of our readers can present additional arguments, we are ready to admit the pump gun, with the double barrel, to "full American citizenship."

To return to the automatic: why is its use against the public interest? Principally, we believe, because of the number of cripples it produces. Nine men out of ten shooting automatics will keep on shooting long after the game has passed out of range. Especially in duck shooting, where large shot is used, this is bound to send lots of birds away carrying lead. These birds eventually die, or else are ruined for breeding purposes, and hence are a dead loss. In this way, it seems to us, the automatic shotgun is exceedingly destructive to game.

Of course there is no logical reason for shooting out of range with an automatic, any more than there is any logical reason for doing so with any other gun. But the point is that it is done, consistently and almost without exception. The shooter forgets to turn it off. Anybody who has hunted ducks along the Rio Grande knows that this is a fact, and as long as automatics are permitted it will continue to be a fact. The only way to prevent it is to prohibit their use.

The passage of an anti-automatic law need not be a hardship on those hunters who are now using automatic guns. Special devices are on the market, by the use of which any automatic can be "keyed down" to two shots. It still remains a perfectly good gun.

Representatives of the large gun makers have stated recently that their companies are no longer "pushing" automatic shotguns on account of the growing and nationwide sentiment against this class of weapon.

The foregoing is the case against the automatic, as we see it. The Pine Cone is anxious to print the best arguments that

can be set forth on all sides of the question. Our readers are invited to give us their views.

PLANT MULBERRIES TO PROTECT ORCHARDS.

The Pine Cone again urges the fruit growers of New Mexico to plant mulberry trees around their orchards. It is a demonstrated fact that most birds prefer mulberries to any other fruit, and will ignore the finest cherries, peaches, or apples if a supply of mulberries is on hand. The trees bear profusely each year, and by planting

ing the price of hunting licenses is being seriously advocated by quite a number of prominent sportsmen throughout the United States. These gentlemen advocate a flat rate on licenses for residents and non-residents alike. They admit that in order to finance the state game departments, the resident will have to pay more if the non-resident pays less. They call the prevalent differential between residents and non-residents discriminatory and unjust. How much meat and how much vacuum inheres in their argument?

The answer is very simple, indeed, and may be given in three sentences:

spared by cats, would save America millions of dollars by killing insects that destroy crops and timber.

In spite of these facts, we do not expect to see all pet cats taken out and chloroformed. However, something can be done to abate the cat nuisance. Here are some of them:

Drown at birth all kittens that are not needed or wanted.

Kill stray, hungry cats. This will be merciful to the cats, and will save many birds.

Don't give the kiddies a kitten to play with. They persecute the kitten, and the



several varieties a succession of berries throughout the season is obtained. There is one variety of non-bearing mulberry adapted for shade only, and this of course should be avoided as a tree for orchard protection. All good nurseries now carry a selection of mulberry stock for planting.

Mulberry trees need not occupy valuable land. They thrive on ditch banks, odd corners, or other waste places. They are very hardy and almost impossible to kill by transplanting. A few mulberries around an orchard may save hundreds of dollars worth of fruit and many valuable insectivorous birds are Nature's spraying outfit, and work sixteen hours a day without wages. They are worth all the encouragement and protection we can give them.

SHALL NON-RESIDENT LICENSES BE ABANDONED?

The abandonment of any distinction between residents and non-residents in fix-

ing the price of hunting licenses is being seriously advocated by quite a number of prominent sportsmen throughout the United States. These gentlemen advocate a flat rate on licenses for residents and non-residents alike. They admit that in order to finance the state game departments, the resident will have to pay more if the non-resident pays less. They call the prevalent differential between residents and non-residents discriminatory and unjust. How much meat and how much vacuum inheres in their argument?

The answer is very simple, indeed, and may be given in three sentences:

The answer is very simple, indeed, and may be given in three sentences:

The answer is very simple, indeed, and may be given in three sentences:

The answer is very simple, indeed, and may be given in three sentences:

kitten retaliates by scratching them.

If you insist on keeping a pet cat, keep a small bell on its neck. A bell will warn the birds.

Don't delude yourself that the average cat is a good mouser. As a mouser, he is a fraud, and doesn't earn his salt. A five-cent mouse trap will catch more mice in a week than a cat can catch in a year.

HODGE GIVES \$350 FOR G. P. A.

The PINE CONE announces with much gratification an unsolicited donation of \$350 from Hugh L. Hodge of Silver City, manager of the Diamond Bar Cattle Company, and president of the State G. P. A. Mr. Hodge's gift makes a big improvement in the lean and hungry treasury of the state association.

The PINE CONE has "missed fire" rather frequently because of lack of funds to publish it. Mr. Hodge's gift again puts the paper temporarily on its feet.