

**ALASKA CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION**

December 14, 1955

## THIRTY-SEVENTH DAY

PRESIDENT EGAN: The Convention will come to order. Chaplain Swaffer of Ladd Air Force Base is here with us this morning. Chaplain Swaffer will give the daily invocation.

CHAPLAIN SWAFFER: Almighty God, Creator of our universe, we invoke the blessing of Thy spirit on this assembly today. Bless each one with creativeness of mind, with uprightness of purpose and spirit. Amen.

PRESIDENT EGAN: The Chief Clerk will call the roll.

(The Chief Clerk called the roll at this time.)

CHIEF CLERK: All present.

PRESIDENT EGAN: A quorum is present. The Convention will proceed with its regular order of business.

HILSCHER: Mr. President, I do not particularly wish to clutter up the daily journal, but Mr. Marston and I believe that this morning's prayer was a concise job well done and well said and we would ask unanimous consent to have it spread upon the journal of the day.

PRESIDENT EGAN: If there is no objection this morning's prayer will be spread upon the journal of the day. Does the special Committee to read the journal have a report to make at this time? Mr. Doogan.

DOOGAN: Mr. President, I have the journals for the 32nd and 33rd Convention days. In the journal of the 32nd day on page 3, under general orders of the day where it states Committee

Proposal No. 2, strike the word "first" and put in the word second. On the journal for the 33rd day, page 4, second paragraph, line 2, after "12:15" insert "o'clock p.m." I move and ask unanimous consent that both journals as corrected be adopted.

PRESIDENT EGAN: Mr. Doogan moves and asks unanimous consent that the journals of both days, the 32nd and 33rd Convention days, be approved as corrected. Is there objection? Hearing no objections it is so ordered. Mr. King.

KING: Mr. President, this morning we have with us Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson who as you all know is one of the foremost authorities in the United States on wildlife and resources. Dr. Gabrielson for eleven years was Director of the Fish and Wildlife and the Biological Survey for the United States. He is presently President of the Wildlife Management Institute.

He came from Washington, D. C., and especially to address this Convention and to appear before the Resources Committee. I would like to introduce Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson.

PRESIDENT EGAN: Dr. Gabrielson, we are happy to have you with us. We would like to have you come forward at this time and address the Convention. (Applause)

DR. GABRIELSON: Ladies and gentlemen, members of this Convention, it is a pleasure to be back in Alaska again and a privilege to talk to you, a privilege in more ways than one because I happen to be very fond of Alaska and during the 31 years that I was in the Federal service, and since I left I have been in the Territory many times and have managed to cover it pretty well, so I am not only fascinated by the country and by the wildlife that it has but I have some personal knowledge of most of it. You are here for a very serious job, and I might say that I have heard nothing but compliments for the way this group has been working since they started their deliberations. What you do here today and tomorrow and in the succeeding days will have a profound influence upon the type of government that you have in this Territory when it becomes a state, and if I can contribute anything to your deliberations or any information that will help you in your deliberations, I will feel that my trip has been very much worthwhile. Before I start to talk about it, I would like to tell you very briefly why I have the temerity to come in as an outsider to talk to a group like this. I have had a unique privilege I think that is not accorded to many Americans to study the organizations that are handling the national resources in the various states. When I went with the Wildlife Management Institute, one of the jobs that that organization undertook was to study and see if there were ways of improving the administration of the renewable resources, particularly the wildlife resources. And as a beginning for that we made a factual survey of all of the states in the Union, of their basic laws, of the type of organization that they had and the kind of work that they were doing. This was done by taking the material in their basic laws and in the annual reports of the various departments, the factual material, and after we had assembled a sheet for each state we sent it to the Department for checking and for correction. And from that we built a basic analysis of the type of organization and the type of work that was being done. Needless to say, in a country as varied as the United States, and its varied background and experience, we found all kinds of organizations and all kinds of attempts to get at the problems of managing the resources. Since that time I have been invited by 26 states and one province in Canada to make careful analytical surveys of their basic laws, their organization for carrying out the purposes of those basic laws and the programs they were working on, so that I have had the opportunity that I don't think that has been accorded to many

people to really have open to their inspection and study the records of 26 state conservation departments. Out of that I have at least distilled a personal philosophy of some of the things that I think are essential in a good wildlife resources or any resource management program. I might say that these departments that I have studied have varied all the way from conservation departments that had fish and wildlife, forests, parks and in some cases minerals and oils and some authority over waters, to those that were only fish and game organizations. Through all of them that were doing a reasonably good job we found that there were certain things always present, and I can outline those to you very briefly. The first one was an adequate authority to do the job, the authority to do a management job in managing a resource that became more complicated because of human use of the land and human activities. The second one was the ability to establish a program and stay with it. Nothing that we can do can quickly influence for good a thing as extended and as complicated as a wildlife population. We can destroy it very quickly. The efforts to build it back sometimes are much more complicated. Efforts to maintain it become more complicated as there are more people in a community. The third is a provision by some method of the ability to attract and keep good people, trained people, experienced people. You can in one of these resource management fields, and I don't think it makes any difference whether you are talking about forests, or fish, or wildlife, or something else, the value of even a trained man grows very much as he becomes familiar with the territory in which he is working and with its problems, and the ability to attract good men and to hold them is one of the essentials. The fourth one is adequate financing to do a job. And those are the four things that were nearly always present or were always present in all organizations that were doing a reasonably good job. Needless to say, some of them were not. There were all degrees between those that you would rank, the half dozen states you would rank at the top and those at the bottom and a lot of them in varying degrees of successful operation between. The most common device that has been developed and is in use for giving adequate authority is the establishment of some kind of an organization within the state government framework to which the legislature has given the authority to manage this resource. It has been given in two ways in the various states. In some cases there are very broad general grants. They have set up an organization and given it the authority to manage those resources with very few limitations. The more common one and one that has been very successful, the basic legislation closes all seasons on all sorts of living things that are protected by the basic laws and then grants to the organization established to handle that program the authority to open seasons and to establish methods and means by which game or fur or fish may be taken in accordance with broad rules that are established in the legislation itself. That is the pattern that was followed in the enabling act for the

migratory bird treaty. It has a lot of advantages and has been used very successfully. So far as the mechanism is concerned for doing that, the one that has been most successful has been the establishment of a commission. Those commissions have varied authority and varied responsibility. Some of them are commissions that handle forests, parks, fish and game, are a fairly common combination in those states where you have a broad conservation establishment. In some states they have added others to it. The majority of them are confined to fish and game, of those that I have studied. Those commissions are successful wherever the basic legislation is the right type of legislation. The best piece of legislation I think that is so regarded by most of the people who have studied it, as far as providing flexible administration and also limitations on what may be done, is the basic Missouri legislation. It has become more or less the model on which many states have revised their game setup as they have outgrown the laws under which they were previously operating. That legislation has stood the test better than any other that has been experimented with, and it was put into effect by profiting by the mistakes of a lot of other states and by the mistakes that have been made in Missouri previously. I hope that out of this Constitutional Convention you can do something that has not to my knowledge ever been done before in America -- you can set up a program before you have practically destroyed the resource. In most states there has never been an adequate management program instituted until the wildlife resources and fishery resources have been very sadly depleted. It became a question of having to do something before anything very adequate was done. That was more true in the older states than in some of the Western states, and you now have the opportunity of profiting by a lot of the mistakes that were made in the trial and error that went on for many years in developing the present type of administration and management of these resources that they have. The continuity of program has been provided pretty largely in the states by this commission type of government with staggered definite terms for the commissioners so that always on the commission there were some experienced people who knew the background, who knew why they were doing some things, and had some knowledge of the program. That type of a system has the advantage of bringing new blood and new points of view in and still not disrupting completely the program that is under way. In states where that has been successful their programs have been, let's say evolutionary. They have developed gradually as they had more knowledge and more information. They have developed programs that have stood up and have been in effect long enough to accomplish something. There is no state department that I have yet studied that has money enough and man power enough to go out and do in a short period of time the things that are necessary to influence for the better, a population of wildlife that they are responsible for, and I use wildlife in a very broad way, including all of the living creatures that we

put under the term of fish and game and fur and various other more restrictive terms. Those have been the most successful. To my surprise when they inaugurated the system of a small commission of equal numbers from both political parties, that has worked better in actual administration than any other system that I have studied. I assumed when they set up a commission of four or six people, half of them from each of the major political parties, that there would be a deadlock over very many issues. The very fact that they might deadlock over them soon convinced them that they had to forget any partisan politics and go to work at looking after the resource, and it has worked wonderfully well. I would like to say this, that I have known a great person in nearly all of the people who have served on these commissions in all of the states in the Union. I think I have known every man who has served on the Alaska Game Commission up to the present time, and by and large those are all people who want to do a job. Where they fail it is because of lack of resources to do a job or lack of authority to do an adequate job. I have found very few of them who did not want to do the best possible job that they could do. These commissions have worked best and have provided continuity of program where they have been established and maintained as broad policy-making bodies -- where they establish the policies which finally determine the regulations for the management of the resources and then have a staff to carry out the program. They fall down most where the commissioners get to dabbling in the day-to-day affairs of the department. I recall sitting in one commission office when I was making a study and hearing one person get three different orders from three different commissioners. He could not possibly have carried them all out, and when I told the commission about it in a private meeting they asked me, "What did he do?" I said "If he was smart he did not do anything because he was going to get in wrong with someone of you no matter what he did. The truth of the matter is you fellows should not be issuing him orders. His orders should come from whoever you select as a director to handle that department." Wherever they have established those commissions as policy determining bodies within the framework of the legislation that they are operating under, they have been successful. Their greatest weakness has been the other. Continuity of employment has been provided most successfully in all of the states I have studied by some sort of a merit system. Sometimes those are state-wide merit systems. The strongest I have happened to study is the civil service setup in the State of New York. It perhaps goes, in some respects, too far in protecting employees because it is difficult to get rid of even an incompetent or bad actor under their laws, but all of the departments that are doing a good job have a merit system of some kind whereby they select the men in competitive examination and set up a promotion system that enables them not only to recruit good people but to keep them. A man who has worked in a territory for ten years and knows that territory

is infinitely more valuable to the people of that community than he would be as a stranger coming in, no matter how competent he might be. There are many different kinds of systems in use. Many of them are not adequate, but in every case where we have found a good management program going on there has been an adequate and satisfactory merit system that was enforced to provide, and a way of attracting and keeping the most competent people that they could get. The fourth one, adequate financing, there is very little difference of opinion among the states. All of them have been financed, are now financed by one device, in most states entirely by license fees which are set aside in an earmarked fund for the use of the agency which is administering that resource. That started many years ago when it was impossible in competition with many other things to get any adequate funds for the enforcement of wild life laws and for the management of wildlife population. I believe the first state that used that as a device for financing the resource management was North Dakota, but it succeeded in raising so much money and North Dakota became apparently so well off in the program that that example was quickly followed by every state in the Union, and there is no state that does not now charge or earmark and segregate the license funds for the use of the department. I know that every budget officer and every accountant that I ever talked to is opposed to that kind of procedure for reasons which seem sufficient to them, but I also know that of the state agencies, the fish and game agencies are always the best financed of any of them. State forestry departments, park departments and others that depend upon legislative appropriations from general funds are relatively much less adequately financed. The people who hunt and fish look upon it as an added tax. They pay the same taxes as others do to the general fund in proportion to their means and under the laws. They look upon this as a tax which they bear willingly to provide for the recreation that they get out of hunting and fishing. I have never seen an equal, and I might say that the movements for the establishment of licenses and the earmarking of license funds have almost invariably come from the people who would pay for those licenses. In almost every case the increased license fees that have been established in states from time to time have been established because of the efforts of the organized sportsmen and license buyers of those states who saw a need for more money and who are willing to provide it. We have a similar system in spite of the objections of budget officers in most states for the financing and maintenance of public roads. by special taxes that are levied through gasoline taxes on people who use the public roads. In most states those are earmarked. Every state earmarks in one way or another the license funds and some other miscellaneous funds are frequently used. Very few states contribute anything out of the general fund for the management of the wildlife resources. In a few states they have at times made special appropriations for what they chose to call capital investments in wildlife.

I recall that some years ago the state of Iowa for example appropriated two and three-quarter million dollars for building artificial lakes for recreation and fishing purposes in a part of the state where there were no lakes. That was not financed out of the game funds. That was from general funds. The maintenance of those lakes is financed out of the earmarked funds. I know of no state that appropriates any money out of general funds for the operations of the fish and game setup, whatever it may be, or for the maintenance of their projects. So that the experience in the various states I have studied all points in one direction that adequate financing can be obtained in that way, rather painlessly, it does not have to come out of general taxes, it comes from the people who use the resource and who are usually quite willing to pay a reasonable fee for that privilege. This fish and wildlife management becomes more complicated, and I am not going to take a lot more of your time. I would like to present to you the things that I have found that are important and not spend a lot of time talking about the bad things because you are interested in developing a program for Alaska which I hope will be better than any program that has ever been started in any state at the beginning of their existence as a state. And you are more dependent in more ways than most states upon these natural resources. They are more important to the average citizen in Alaska by far than they are to the average citizens in a state like New York, for example. They deserve a lot of consideration, and it will depend upon you and what you do in their management whether or not you can preserve the very remarkable and unique wildlife resource you have in this Territory. I would like to point out one other series of things before I stop. I told you that the Missouri setup was as far as basic law was concerned, the best one that I have seen. I think that is the consensus of opinion of all of the wildlife people who have studied the basic laws. It is relatively simple, it grants definite authorities, it sets up certain standards that must be followed and it has worked well. It was put into the constitution because it was impossible to get through the legislature in that state any improvement in the basic laws that governed the administration of that resource, and the people got finally so fed up with it that they put this thing on the initiative and put it in the constitution as one way of getting some change for the better, and it worked. It brought Missouri from the position of one of the three or four worst states from the standpoint of administration of its resources, right to the top. I could not say that any state had the best department because they are working under too many varied conditions to be comparable, but Missouri is one of the top states, in the program that is carried out, in the continuity that it has been able to put into its program, and in the results they have obtained in building back some of the resources that were destroyed, and in improving and maintaining some of those that were still in existence. This problem has gotten more complicated as

years go by, and I would like to tell you very briefly what the limited things are that we can do to influence for the better the wildlife resources. After all, there are many natural factors over which we have no control that determine in the long run how much and what kind of wildlife that can exist in a given territory. Those that are there are there because they can exist under those handicaps and conditions that they must contend with. Historically, we have had four or five things that we have tried to use to influence for the better these wildlife populations. The oldest, let me say wildlife management practice historically is the practice of limiting the human harvest that is taken out of the crop. The very oldest laws that we have governing game and fishing go back to colonial days when they commenced to limit the time or the number that could be taken close to the settlements. Those laws were good only to the extent that they could be enforced. The making of laws and enforcement of them is still an important part of wildlife management. It probably always will be, and those laws serve two functions. They should serve primarily for the protection and maintenance of the resource, but many of our laws are written for the purpose of distributing the utilization of that resource between different groups or different purposes, and that is where much of the controversy comes. Wildlife management, if you could deal only with the wild populations and their problems, would be relatively simple, but in my opinion most wildlife management consists of five per cent dealing with wildlife things and 95 per cent dealing with wild people, and most of the problems and most of the headaches in wildlife administration come from human attitudes and human problems not from the wildlife problems. For a long time that making of laws and their more or less adequate enforcement was the only management device we had. The next one in sequence was predator control. We developed a philosophy that if we could kill off enough predators we would have the deers or quail or pheasants nine feet deep all over the landscape. It did not work. Predator control is a useful tool where predators are a limiting factor on the game. Twenty years of my field experience were spent in that type of work. I can tell you honestly in many cases our predator control programs resulted in direct and immediate increases in the game population. I can also tell you with equal honesty that for every case of that kind we had many dozens where it showed no appreciable results in better game population. The answer is of course that predators were not always the limiting factor on the number of other wild creatures that were there. Where they were, the reduction of predator population brought very quick response. The next phobia we had that was going to solve all problems was making refuges. We made refuges by the thousands and covering millions of acres. Many of them were paper refuges with no boundary markers or no enforcement and they did no good. Refuges again, we found had their value and they also had their limits. They were not the answer to all the problems.

They are chiefly valuable in many cases as a way of preserving suitable habitat for a game or fish or wildlife population and they have their place in the picture. They are not a cure-all. They do not solve anywhere near all the problems. The next great delusion we had was imported from Europe from where we brought the system of artificial propagation and distribution of wildlife over. It works in Europe. It works in this country where cost is not a factor. You can't raise pheasants and quail and certain other things and liberate them right ahead of the guns and get a lot of shooting. Where you have to do it on limited public funds it is one of the best ways to waste money that I know of as a general practice. You have not gotten into that in Alaska. I hope that you don't. It has its use in limited ways. It has been very useful in establishing populations in areas where habitat has become suitable again and where the population has long been exterminated or expatriated from that area. For example, the Pennsylvania deer herd which is one of the great deer herds that any state has built so far as anyone knows entirely from deer that were trapped and brought in there and released. At the time that program was started in 1902, as far as anyone knew there were no deer left in the State of Pennsylvania. They purchased and brought in there many hundreds of deer, released them, protected them and built the present herd that way, so this propagation and release has its place in the picture. Again it did not prove to be a cure-all, and we have one other tool which is becoming increasingly important in the states, in the more densely populated states, and that is this question of habitat management of taking the land that is still available for the production of wildlife that is not demanded exclusively for human use and developing it to produce the maximum amount of wildlife that can be produced on that land, and that has been a very successful program. It again has its limitations. It will work where the question of suitable shelter and suitable food is the limiting factor on the wildlife population. That is true in many places, and it has been a successful program where it meets the problems. My reason for reviewing this is to point out to you just one thing. We are all Americans, we like to express our opinions, and I know of no group that expresses their opinions more violently or forcibly than the fellows who hunt and fish. You can get more argument and more heat and less light on a given subject by bringing up something in a sportsmen's meeting than in any place that I know. That is our great American privilege. We have these techniques. They are all useful if they are used at the time and place where they are needed, but to sit down and try to draft laws or to say to an organization, "You have to use this particular tool, you have to spend your money for this particular tool", is comparable in my mind to my hiring a carpenter to build a house according to some blue prints I have drawn and say, "But I don't want you to use anything but a hammer when you build it". The carpenter should be the man who knows which tool he can use most efficiently in building a

house. We have these tools. We have developed within these tremendous broad categories of management tools I have outlined, many ways of applying them. They are useless unless they are applied at the time and place where they are needed. And we have developed more and more in this country in the last 40 years a group of trained men who are trained to know when and how to use those tools, just as an expert machinist knows when and how to use his tools. A man can go to school and study carpentry and go to a trade school, but he is not a good carpenter when he comes out of the trade school. He becomes a good carpenter by using those tools, by learning how and when to use them. The same thing is true in this wildlife field. The only way we have found in the states to get good administration of these resources is to set up an organization of some kind that consists of men who make it their business to find out the facts and to determine which tool to use and how to use it and to the extent that the departments have been given that authority and that ability we have good game departments. I made a study of one department to show you the other extreme where over two elections they had a 185 per cent turnover in the personnel, and that went for everything in the office, both ways. Now it is not possible to manage a resource on that kind of a basis. The only reason it had not been a 200 per cent turnover was because there were a few people who had drifted into that department that had civil service status in some other departments and they could not take it away from them, and the second reason was that the new governor had not been there quite long enough to get rid of all of them at the time I made the study. Needless to say, they had no program in that state except to spend the money that was turned in from the license fees. There is no appreciable result from it and there cannot be. Those that went in, some of them, developed into good people. About the time they were getting to know what they were doing they got fired to make way for another fellow who had to do the learning job all over again. There is no instance in the history of the state where that kind of management of wildlife or forest or any other renewable resource has been productive. That is one of the reasons I think for the spreading movement in states to write into the constitutions basic laws which theoretically should not be in the constitution, but it has been one way of preventing that kind of management or lack of management. There are now I believe five states that have written it into their constitution and there are two states which will probably be voting on it at the next election, and it is a popular way of expressing their disapproval at least of the use of the earmarked funds for purely partisan political purposes for building for personal political machines, and it has been wasteful of the resource which is much more important than the wastefulness that has come from the money. It has been wasteful of the resources themselves, and it is not possible to manage any renewable natural resource under that kind of a system, so I present that, personally I can see lots

of objections to putting that kind of legislation into a constitution. Theoretically it does not belong there, but I am telling you practically, that it has produced the most results of anything I have seen in the way of good administration. It's just like the budget officer's objection to earmarked funds, I can understand that from an accounting standpoint it is bad business, but it has produced results that were never produced by any other system, so you have to balance in your thinking or at least should try to balance in your thinking the theoretical as against the practical results that you will get in managing this resource that means so much to all of you. I know of no place under the American flag where the wildlife resources are so important to the average citizen and will continue to be for a long time as they are in this Territory. I wish you luck in your deliberations. I understand I am going to meet with your Resources Committee, and I hope to try to answer some of the questions they may ask. I thank you very much for the privilege of appearing before you and hope I have at least given you something to think about. (Applause)

PRESIDENT EGAN: Mr. Barr.

BARR: Mr. President, would it be possible to ask Dr. Gabrielson a question or two?

PRESIDENT EGAN: If there is no objection, Mr. Barr, you may ask a question.

BARR: I would like to have you make a brief statement on the Dingell-Johnson Act or any similar act in which the state gets federal aid and particularly whether or not it is possible to obtain that aid other than by earmarked funds. For instance, we have it in the laws that we should appropriate a like amount to the funds received from license fees.

DR. GABRIELSON: I don't know that I understand just the purpose of the question, but both the Dingell-Johnson Act and the Pittman-Robinson Act, in both federal aid acts for the states, are earmarked funds based upon the excise taxes on sporting arms and ammunition in the one case and on sport fishing tackle in the other. Historically, about 1936 or 1937 a great many of the emergency taxes that were placed during the beginning of the depression on various, and some went back to the first world war, were repealed. At the request of the sportsmen of the country and of the manufacturers themselves, the excise tax on sporting arms and ammunition was continued at the time they repealed all of the others and earmarked for wildlife management purposes. That bill provided the method by which those funds would be distributed and the formulas under which they would be distributed and also provided that the states had to match them, put in 25 per cent or one-third of the amount that the federal allocation amounted to in order

to be available for that. The Dingell-Johnson Act has similar provisions. It was enacted much later, and the tax that was then in existence on sport fishing tackles was continued as a special excise tax. Again, a form of self-assessment that was promoted by the sportsmen of the country, and under those laws I don't know whether you would get very far if you repealed that earmarked funds, whether you would get Congress to appropriate that much money for that purpose. Those are rather sizeable funds. My experience in eleven years of trying to get money out of Congress was not very encouraging. There is too much competition for the amount of money that is available and a lot of other things that are to the general public seemingly much more important, and I have found it very difficult to convince the Congress that they should give me any money for the wildlife program and I think that has been the experience in the various states. Theoretically, I suppose it could be done. Practically, it would be an uphill battle.

TAYLOR: Could you give us the name of the four or five states that have the best system of game conservation so that we can look these matters up.

DR. GABRIELSON: It is hard to say they have the best system. There are several that are doing outstanding jobs. Some of them are doing good jobs in spite of poor laws because they have exceptionally good people. My observation has been that good people can make most any kind of a system work, but people can do a lot better job with a good system. Poor people can't make any kind of a system work, it all goes back in the long run, but the states in my opinion who are doing outstanding jobs are states like Oregon, Washington, Missouri, Michigan, Iowa. Their systems vary, their emphasis on their programs vary, but they are doing a good job in managing what resources they have.

TAYLOR: What about Missouri?

DR. GABRIELSON: I did mention Missouri. Missouri, Michigan, Pennsylvania, which has very poor laws but a fine organization and fine staff, Oregon, Washington, Iowa are among those that are doing a top job with resources. I might add California. You find every variation that is conceivable in them. Basically they are doing good jobs for one reason or another.

SMITH: Mr. President, also in the gallery this morning we have Mr. Arthur W. Greeley, Regional Forester for Alaska, who has rendered invaluable assistance to the Resources Committee, and I would like to ask unanimous consent that Mr. Greeley be given an opportunity to say a few words at this time.

PRESIDENT EGAN: If there is no objection, Mr. Greeley, would you like to come in and say a few words to the Convention. (Applause)

MR. GREELEY: Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, this comes as very much of a surprise to me. I have really no comments to pass on. I do want to say that Dr. Gabrielson spoke for resources in general even though he was referring specifically to the wildlife resource. When I was coming up here to appear before the Resources Committee I made quite a list of items that I thought it was important to call to the attention of the Resources Committee, and at the top of the list I had the need for competent people. Well Dr. Gabrielson certainly covered that point. Also on the list I had the need for nonpartisan or at least nonpolitical boards to the extent boards are needed. Again Dr. Gabrielson covered that point, and actually just about all of the features which result in a good wildlife program in individual states have their counterpart in features which result in a good forestry program in individual states. I think the future of the State of Alaska depends in large measure on what can be done with the forest resource certainly as much as with the wildlife resource. I think the wisdom of the program which is evolved, both through the constitutional provisions and the subsequent provisions of a resource code, will in large measure indicate the success of the type of program. In fact, it is more than just the success of a resource management program, the success of our statehood ambitions depends in large measure on what we are able to do with our resources. I know you are pressed for time. Thank you very much for this opportunity. I greatly appreciate the chance to appear before you.

PRESIDENT EGAN: Thank you. (Applause) The Convention will come to order. Are there any communications from outside the Convention?

CHIEF CLERK: No.

PRESIDENT EGAN: Is there any other business to come before the Convention at this time? Are there reports of standing or select committees? Mr. Cross?

CROSS: I have a report from the Resolutions and Recommendations Committee.

PRESIDENT EGAN: Mr. Cross has a report of the Resolutions and Recommendations Committee.

CROSS: We have a proposal which is a compromise, a consolidation of three proposals and one resolution which was submitted to this Committee. It has been consolidated. The Committee report is really an ordinance, but we are recommending an ordinance which I would like to place on the Secretary's desk.

PRESIDENT EGAN: Are you recommending, Mr. Cross, that your resolution be, that your proposal be referred to the Ordinance Committee? Is that it?

CROSS: We are placing this as a proposal. It is in reality an ordinance but we are placing it on the Secretary's desk as a proposal to go through.

PRESIDENT EGAN: The Sergeant at Arms may place the proposal on the Secretary's desk. The proposal may be read for the second time.

ROBERTSON: Mr. President, the proposal has not yet been mimeographed. I think that Mr. Cross just wants to introduce the proposal at this time.

PRESIDENT EGAN: Well the Chair misunderstood, Mr. Cross. The Chair thought that you were introducing a committee proposal which combined several proposals which had been sent to your Committee, but if that is the case, the proposal, did you want it read for the second time as a committee proposal? Mr. Sundborg?

SUNDBORG: Mr. President, I move and ask unanimous consent that the proposal just introduced by the Resolutions and Recommendations Committee be read for the first time by title only and referred to the Rules Committee for placement on the calendar.

ROBERTSON: I second the motion.

PRESIDENT EGAN: If there is no objection the proposal will be read for the first time and referred to the Rules Committee for placement on the calendar. The Convention will stand at recess for one or two minutes.

#### RECESS

PRESIDENT EGAN: The Convention will come to order. The Chief Clerk will read the proposal for the first time.

CHIEF CLERK: "Committee Proposal No. 4, by Committee on Recommendations and Resolutions, LOCATION OF STATE CAPITAL, AND PROCEDURE FOR CHANGE THEREOF."

PRESIDENT EGAN: The proposal is referred to the Rules Committee for placement on the calendar. Are there other proposals? Mr. Metcalf.

METCALF: Mr. Chairman, I have a proposal.

PRESIDENT EGAN: The Sergeant at Arms will please bring the proposal forward. The Chief Clerk may read the proposal for the first time.

CHIEF CLERK: "Delegate Proposal No. 43, by Mr. Metcalf, BILL OF RIGHTS."

PRESIDENT EGAN: The proposal is referred to the Committee on Preamble and Bill of Rights. Is there any other unfinished business? Are there reports of any committees at this time? Mr. Smith.

SMITH: Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Resources Committee will meet to hear Dr. Gabrielson immediately following the recess if a recess is had before noon, and I think that under the present circumstances it would be advisable to hold the meeting in this room due to the fact there are probably a large number of delegates and probably quite a number of people in the gallery who would like to hear what Dr. Gabrielson has to present to the Committee.

HELLENTHAL: There will be a meeting of Committee VI, ten minutes following the recess.

AWES: The Committee on Bill of Rights will meet for just a few minutes immediately after recess.

NEWLAND: The Finance Committee will meet immediately after recess for a short time.

PRESIDENT EGAN: Are there other committee announcements? Mr. Rosswog.

ROSSWOG: Local Government Committee No. XII will meet at 10:30 following this session in their committee room.

PRESIDENT EGAN: The Chair would like to -- Mr. McNealy?

MCNEALY: Committee announcement, Mr. President. The Committee on Ordinances will meet about ten minutes after the recess.

PRESIDENT EGAN: The Committee on Ordinances will meet about ten minutes after the recess. The Chair was going to suggest in line with conversations that were held with all committee chairmen yesterday that perhaps it might be well if the Elections, Resources, and Local Government Committees could meet now and if necessary until 3 o'clock or 3:20 this afternoon and those committees that normally meet in the afternoon then at that time would have a clear way ahead of them without any interference with these other committees. Do the committee chairmen recall the manner in which we discussed this yesterday? What is the opinion of the chairmen and the delegates?

NERLAND: Mr. President, I think the Finance Committee was the only committee that our membership had representation on the other committees, so I can see from the standpoint of the other committees that is the most satisfactory manner. If it would be possible to allot the time a little bit differently than 3 o'clock or later for the final meeting. I think it would be better.

PRESIDENT EGAN: Perhaps if there is no objection the Convention could stand at recess for two or three minutes and the Committee Chairmen and members of the committees can get together here on the Convention floor and come to some agreement on meeting times so there will be no conflicts. If there is no objection the Convention is at recess.

RECESS

PRESIDENT EGAN: The Convention will come to order. Mr. Johnson.

JOHNSON: Mr. President, it is my understanding that Mrs. Jones will be here shortly before noon tomorrow, and in order to permit the class to attend the plenary session after lunch, I understand we are to be hosts to the class during the lunch. It seems that on that basis that when we do adjourn now we should adjourn until 1:30 tomorrow afternoon, and subject to any committee announcements I so move.

PRESIDENT EGAN: Mr. Johnson moves that the Convention stand adjourned until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow. Mr. Victor Rivers.

V. RIVERS: The Committee on Executive will meet at 2:00 this afternoon in the committee room.

PRESIDENT EGAN: The Committee on the Executive will meet at 2:00 this afternoon in the committee room. Mrs. Hermann.

HERMANN: Has the committee that was in charge of this luncheon sorted the children out to the different delegates?

PRESIDENT EGAN: Mrs. Hermann, we are going to do that today and we will say that prior to the arrival of the children that you will have the names.

HERMANN: I was just a little bit afraid some delegates might not come before lunch if the meeting is not called until 1:30.

PRESIDENT EGAN: It will be understood by all delegates that we are duty bound to be there and live up to the obligation that we have proposed on ourselves in requesting that these children come and be our guests at luncheon tomorrow.

HERMANN: I would like a further question Mr. President, in regard to the bus service we will have to cancel for in the morning apparently, or not. I do not know.

PRESIDENT EGAN: Mrs. Hermann, the Chair would feel that all the delegates would probably catch the same bus in order to be here for the committee meetings or most of them would.

HELLENTHAL: Is there a motion before the house?

PRESIDENT EGAN: Mr. Johnson moved. The Chair did not hear a second as yet that the Convention stand adjourned until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow.

JOHNSON: I ask unanimous consent.

HELLENTHAL: I object for the moment.

ROBERTSON: I second the motion.

HELLENTHAL: I would like to propose that we meet tonight at 8 o'clock in plenary session to discuss the pending proposals before the body.

METCALF: I second the motion.

PRESIDENT EGAN: We already have a motion for adjournment before us and an amendment would not be in order. Mr. Sundborg?

SUNDBORG: Had Mr. Hellenthal been recognized?

PRESIDENT EGAN: Mr. Robertson seconded the motion.

SUNDBORG: As I heard it though Mr. Robertson seconded it after. It seems to me Mr. Hellenthal's motion is on the floor.

PRESIDENT EGAN: It could not be, Mr. Sundborg, because the motion to amend the adjournment would not be in order.

SUNDBORG: Well it would not be if it was seconded.

PRESIDENT EGAN: His motion stated that he was attempting to amend the motion. We have before us the question of adjournment until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow. The committee announcements are open. Are there other committee announcements to be made at this time? Mr. Ralph Rivers.

R. RIVERS: If we are going to host these school children I think we ought to have a roll call about 12 o'clock tomorrow. Then I suppose we will be taking them up at 12:30 around the usual time. I think we are going to get balled up if we are going to find out which children we are supposed to host and if the committee has to chase us down individually we are going to get all balled up if we don't get together about 12 o'clock.

PRESIDENT EGAN: Would that be satisfactory to you, Mr. Johnson?

JOHNSON: Entirely.

PRESIDENT EGAN: If there is no objection the maker of the motion has acceded to the suggestion to make the adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow. Mr. Taylor.

TAYLOR: Mr. President, was there not an amendment to that motion?

PRESIDENT EGAN: There can't be an amendment to that motion. It is out of order.

ROSSWOG: May I make another committee announcement? The Local Government Committee will meet at 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

PRESIDENT EGAN: The Local Government Committee will meet at 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

COGHILL: Mr. Chairman, in line with Mr. Hellenthal's idea, I would like to ask through the Chair if the maker of the motion would accede to having his motion changed to 8 o'clock this evening.

TAYLOR: Mr. President, I think Mr. Hellenthal's motion was in order according to Robert's Rules of Order. A motion that fixes the time to be adjourned can be amended.

PRESIDENT EGAN: If there is no objection the Convention will stand at recess for a minute or two.

#### RECESS

PRESIDENT EGAN: The Convention will come to order.

METCALF: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question.

PRESIDENT EGAN: If there is no objection you may ask a question, Mr. Metcalf.

METCALF: Will all the committee proposals be submitted by the end of the week so when we go home for our Christmas vacation we can have a complete list of proposals so we can think and talk intelligently on all sections of the constitution?

PRESIDENT EGAN: Mr. Metcalf that is the purpose of course in attempting to adjourn for a longer length of time than is ordinarily the case, in order to allow the committees that are just now practically in the process of reporting their proposals to do so, and we hope that all committees will have reported their proposals back to the convention by the time we are ready to take the hearings recess. Mr. Barr.

BARR: There seems to be a tendency on the part of some of the members to insist on the plenary sessions. These plenary sessions are not important now. The committee reports are. A man holding a hearing or attending a hearing isn't properly equipped unless he has a stack of all of the mimeographed

copies of the committee reports to refer to, and he can't answer questions from the public, and the most important thing right now is committee reports to have them out and have them mimeographed before the recess. If we do work in the evening it should not be in plenary sessions, but should be on committees.

PRESIDENT EGAN: The Chair has been allowing discussion but of course under this motion it is not debatable, and the question is, "Shall the Convention stand adjourned until 12 noon tomorrow?" All those in favor of the motion will signify by saying "aye", all opposed "no". The "ayes" have it and the Convention stands adjourned until 12 noon tomorrow.