

LOUISIANA WILD LIFE AND FISHERIES COMMISSION

---:---

P R O C E E D I N G S

SPECIAL BOARD MEETING

Friday, March 7, 1975

10:00 o'clock a.m.

HARVEY CLAY LUTTRELL, Chairman

Wild Life and Fisheries  
Building  
400 Royal Street  
New Orleans, Louisiana

Kathryn G. Chamberlin,  
Reporter



Helen R. Dietrich, inc.

*Stenotypists*

333 ST. CHARLES AVENUE, SUITE 1221  
NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA 70130 • (504) 524-4782

P R O C E E D I N G S

. . . A Special Meeting of the Board of Louisiana Wild Life and Fisheries Commission was held on Friday, March 7, 1975, at 10:00 o'clock a.m., at the Wild Life and Fisheries Building, 400 Royal Street, New Orleans, Louisiana, Harvey Clay Luttrell, Chairman, presiding.

PRESENT WERE:

- HARVEY CLAY LUTTRELL, Chairman
- MARC DUPUY, JR., Member
- JEAN LAPEYRE, Member
- JIMMIE THOMPSON, Member
- DONALD F. WILLE, Member.

A G E N D A

MR. HARRY SCHAFFER

- 1. Final approval of contract for the installation of a fence around the property in New Iberia where District VI will be built. (18)

MR. TED O'NEIL

- 2. Discussion of raccoon hunting regulations and/or legislation proposals. (21)



MR. RICHARD YANCEY

3. Discussion of land acquisition program, (63)  
Richland Parish tract.
4. Consideration of purchase of Schlieder (65)  
Foundation Tract located in St. John  
the Baptist Parish.
5. Consider shooting hours for duck hunting, (88)  
framework for woodcock and goose  
hunting.

NOTE: The following items not on the printed  
agenda were also considered at the meeting:

- Introduction of guests. (4;  
29)
- Notice of intention to consider rules of (7)  
practice of Commission at April meeting.
- Discussion of leghold/steel jaw trap legis- (56)  
lation.
- Discussion of land acquisition, Avoyelles (85)  
Parish.
- Vote of thanks to Commission Member Marc (87)  
Dupuy for his efforts in the Avoyelles  
Parish land acquisition matter.
- Discussion of environmental impact statement (92)  
re migratory waterfowl hunting regula-



tions for 1975-76.

Reaffirmation of resolution re Louisiana's (97)  
entrance into the Central Flyway.

Recognition of conservation efforts of (104)  
Mr. DeWeese Kostmayer.

Adjournment. (106)

---:---

CHAIRMAN LUTTRELL: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Of course, the advertised purpose of this special meeting today is so that we could be available to our fellow sportsmen and most-times companions. Sometimes we differ on Wild Life and Fisheries questions, but not always. We are available for their state meeting today.

The meeting was announced for ten o'clock and I will apologize, but we had some of those people who needed to be here and couldn't get here right at ten.

I told Mr. Edgar Veillon we needed to have a little pre-meeting on some of the things that had come up lately concerning the new



Constitution and other things and we would perhaps delay it thirty minutes. He isn't here but he will be here with the Regional Director as soon as they can get things straightened out at the hotel.

We have with us today some extra guests and people that we are always very happy to have and very happy to see. I would like to introduce today one of our best visitors, our most constant visitors, Mrs. Mike Cook, in the back.

And Mrs. Hurley Campbell. I just had to go over and find out if I was correct; I didn't want to announce her as someone else.

Then we have, I believe, a first-time visitor and one that is certainly welcome and should be here all the time. Mrs. Marc Dupuy. Mrs. Dupuy, will you stand up?

(Mrs. March Dupuy here acknowledged the Chairman's introduction.)

And a person -- you are not going to believe this -- that I have begged to come with me to this meeting time and time again, because I



thought she needed to watch me very closely, my wife.

MR. JIMMIE THOMPSON: You mean your boss!

THE CHAIRMAN: My boss! We were visiting up at the capital one day and Governor Edwards, as you know, is always very fast on the trigger. I had brought him a crate of strawberries, and when I started to leave, he said, "Mr. Luttrell, thank you for the strawberries and come back some time and bring your lovely daughter with you." You know, I haven't been back to visit that man since. I don't think I am going to go back down there.

MR. THOMPSON: Clay, I know you are stalling for time, waiting for Edgar and some of those boys you promised you would try and delay this meeting, so I am going to tell you all something. I had the pleasure of his and his wife's company driving down here yesterday. I won't say anything about the drive, because if it hadn't been for Mrs. Luttrell and I, and I didn't help much, I don't believe we would have got there, but we finally made it with Belle helping.



THE CHAIRMAN: Well, to tell you the truth about it, the lady helps me so much in driving that when I come to a bend in the road and she doesn't say right or left, I just go right on through.

MR. THOMPSON: That's true!

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. Well, we are glad to have you, and I would like to say this, that the meeting is being held to make the Commission available to those people from our Sportsmen's Leagues who would like to have something to say. As in all meetings, I want to say that you are all welcome to speak, if you have something to bring before the Commission for the good of the Commission. I would ask that you be recognized by the Chair, wave your hand or whistle or hold your hand up or something, and I would like you to come to the mike, state who you are and who you represent and so forth.

Now, if we have nothing else in the way of preliminaries, I believe we will get started with the first part of this meeting and call Mr. Martinez, who has something to bring before the



Commission and needs to get away.

MR. MARTINEZ: Thank you. I do have a draft of some rules of practice for the Commission, to bring the Commission in compliance with the revisions of the Administrative Procedures Act.

As you know, the Administrative Procedures Act was revised at the last legislature and some rather serious changes were made, one of which was the new requirement that all action to be taken by the Commission be advertised in the Register, the Administrative Register, giving twenty days notice of any action to be taken; also twenty days notice of action taken must be given before any action by the Commission can become effective.

I have therefore prepared a set of rules of practice for the Commission to use, to work by, to comply with that Act, and in order to adopt these rules, it is necessary that we advertise in this month, which is March, that we intend to consider them at the April meeting, so I would ask that we advertise the intention to consider these rules at the April meeting.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard Mr.



Martinez' recommendation. Do we have any discussion by the Board? Do I have a motion?

MR. MARC DUPUY, JR.: So move.

MR. DONALD F. WILLE: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved by Mr. Dupuy, seconded by Mr. Wille. Those in favor, say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

THE CHAIRMAN: Opposed, no.

(No response)

The ayes have it. So ordered.

MR. THOMPSON: Clay, I was going to wait until some more of those boys from the Federation get here and tell them. I would like for this to be explained and I am sure you can do it better, or Marc or someone, how much delay this is going to cause the Commission and just what the procedure is.

THE CHAIRMAN: We can ask him to do that. There may be some in the crowd now that would like to have all of that. Do you have time?

MR. MARTINEZ: I have time and I will be happy to do it. The Administrative Procedures Act requires that all action by the Commission be



advertised and give twenty days notice of action. However, the notice has to be published in the Register, which is only published once a month, on the twentieth of the month.

I can use an example which demonstrates it quite explicitly. In order to take action on these particular rules, it is necessary that we advertise in the Register. We can advertise this month and the Register will be published on the twentieth of March. We cannot take action until the April meeting of the Commission, which is the last Tuesday of the month, so the action taken will be after the April Register, so we cannot publish our action until May. Action does not become effective until twenty days after publication, so the action that I am now calling for will not be effective until June 10, twenty days after the May Register is published.

In effect, what I am telling you is that, incidentally, in order to be published in the Register for this month, I have to provide the Division of Administration with the information on or about the tenth of the month, so they have to



have it very shortly. If the Commission wants a determination by its attorney or by the Division of Administration as to whether or not our action is in fact rule-making, that has to get to the attorney by the first of the month. So, we are talking about a hundred days from the day the intention to act is first noticed to the Commission and the day that it becomes effective under the new rules.

This considerably changes the procedures and the traditional way in which we used to act. I think we used to act quite frankly better than most Commissions. We gave much more notice and took much more care in notifying the public of our intended actions.

THE CHAIRMAN: What you are telling us then, just by way of illustration, and I am glad Mike is here so that the public will, I know, get the full impact of this thing, many times our shrimp fishermen and other people come before us, wanting to change the season as set, for very good reasons. This makes it almost impossible to change it in time to do any good.



MR. MARTINEZ: Well, it would --

THE CHAIRMAN: Unless it was an emergency.

MR. MARTINEZ: -- unless it is an emergency, and there are some very restrictive interpretations on what an emergency is. Of course, the Commission is going to have to certify to the Governor that it is an emergency, and I am sure the Commission is going to be a little circumspect about what they are going to certify to the Governor is an emergency.

THE CHAIRMAN: Jimmie, I believe you mentioned something that I thought might bring this out a little more clearly to our public.

MR. THOMPSON: Well, I think it is all clear that we are stymied. We have got a set of handcuffs and leg irons on us, and until there is some proper legislation implemented to correct this, we are in just -- pardon my English -- a hell of a shape.

MR. MARTINEZ: I have examined the Act and I think it could be corrected. I think it would not be inconsistent with other administrative acts which attempt to do the same thing. I think this



could be corrected by calling for or providing for advertisement only in the official journal of the State of Louisiana, which is a daily publication.

The problem is that the Act currently requires publication in a publication which is only published once a month, on the twentieth of the month, and if it were a daily publication, it would shorten that hundred-day period from the day that you have to provide notice to the day that it would become effective to forty days at least.

I would like to see only ten days notice necessary. That is what it used to be, but the legislature expanded it to twenty days, for some reason. I think that ten days is more than adequate notice for most attorneys and most organizations to get into action. I think that ten days would have been adequate here. Actually, what I would like to see, what I would recommend, is that the legislature be approached to allow advertising in the official journal only of the state.

Now the Administrative Register could be used as a very important tool for recording what action is taken, providing a source to find out



what action was taken, and require that it be printed there, but not require that notice be published there. That is what is causing the problem. Unless, of course, they want to go into weekly publication of the Register.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Martinez, you correct me because I am not a lawyer and I am not too familiar with this, though I have studied it quite in detail, but even a delay of forty days from the publication of intent to the publication of putting an act or a decision into force is most times too much of a delay to help the public, anyway, even forty days, and a hundred days makes it really no use to act or ask to act.

MR. MARTINEZ: That is why I say ten days on each side.

MR. THOMPSON: What is the official publication of the State of Louisiana?

MR. MARTINEZ: THE STATE TIMES in Baton Rouge, I believe.

THE CHAIRMAN: I believe that is correct.

MR. MARTINEZ: I think that, practically speaking, the publication of notice in the Register



is going to be serviceable, useful, only to a limited number of people. It costs \$25 a year for the subscription and you also have to publish in THE STATE TIMES. You can't just publish in the Register. You have got to publish in THE STATE TIMES also at the present time.

I think if they would just remove the restriction it would help a great deal, if they would just remove the restriction that you advertise in the Register.

MR. THOMPSON: Certainly I would be one for controls, restrictions, so that everything could be properly done, but there is a limit to so many things that all I can envision with this thing is more red tape, not workable, not applicable on the grass roots level, and in my estimation some legislation -- certainly we are not the only agency that is in this thing. Other agencies are in a similar fix, and I recognize, or I think I recognize the merits of the action that the legislature has taken. I have no quarrel with the legislature, but I think that they have made some mistakes, that they haven't gone deep enough into



this thing and delved enough into it to make it workable, is what I am saying, and this has got to be changed, in my estimation.

I am recommending that legislation be implemented to change it, just as I did last month on our Constitutional amendment, at our last meeting. We have got to change some of these inequities to make this thing work. It just won't work the way by law it says it can and it will.

Of course, the pressure probably will go right back to the legislators and I am hoping that they will see this and probably will rectify this on their own, but I certainly hope that people in our department will work up, along with you, Mr. Martinez, will work up a set of recommendations that will allow us to operate this Commission as well as comply with all the necessary and normal laws of the state to keep us within the bounds and means.

MR. MARTINEZ: The purpose of the Act is to make commissions and agencies of the state accessible to the public and that is certainly a worthwhile and worthy endeavor, but I think what



happened was that the legislature didn't realize that the Register would only be published once a month or at least they didn't realize what effect that would have, and I think it has defeated the purpose of their intention.

MR. THOMPSON: Well, let me point out one other thing, too, that probably they didn't take into consideration, and that is the astronomical cost of this thing, to implement it not only for the Commission but persons who want to be kept advised. I think the publication is -- what, thirty-some dollars a month?

MR. MARTINEZ: \$45 to the individual subscriber.

MR. THOMPSON: So if you want to know, everybody in the state of Louisiana has got to spend \$45 to read one of these books, one of these publications. It just goes on and on and on, and it could bankrupt Wild Life and Fisheries.

MR. DEWEESE KOSTMAYER: Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Kostmayer.

MR. KOSTMAYER: Don't you have some emergency procedures in this situation?



MR. MARTINEZ: Yes, sir, you have some emergency procedures, but as I pointed out, the emergency procedures are strictly interpreted, and it does have to be a legitimate emergency. They do have emergency procedures.

THE CHAIRMAN: And you listed, I think, procedures under which we can declare an emergency. We have to --

MR. MARTINEZ: We have to certify to the Division of Administration and to the Governor that it is an emergency and the Attorney General.

THE CHAIRMAN: And the Attorney General and prove it. Sometimes that takes about as much time as --

MR. MARTINEZ: That could take over 100 days.

MR. DUPUY: And then the declaration of the emergency has to be published on the front page of the Register --

MR. MARTINEZ: Right.

MR. DUPUY: -- and you might sometimes find yourself in an embarrassing position, claiming an emergency for the fixing of a season.



MR. MARTINEZ: In addition to which, the action taken in an emergency is only valid for 120 days, so you have to take emergency action, if you miss publication -- this is a real possibility -- if you miss publication, get caught in a bad time line there, the emergency action expires before you can initiate normal proceedings to make it effective permanently, so your emergency procedure won't be any good.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Martinez. I understand you have another meeting to go to and, if there is no other question, we have voted and passed the recommendation. Thank you.

You are taking Harry's place?

MR. MAX SUMMERS: Yes. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Commission, this is a request to ratify a completed contract as regards the installation of a galvanized chain link fence on our property in Iberia Parish where a new district field office will be built later on this year.

The contract is completed. It has been examined and the workmanship and materials are in compliance with the contract, and we recommend



that you approve final payment of this contract.  
Ten percent remains to be paid.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the statement and recommendation. Do we have any questions or any discussion by the Members? If not, do I have a motion?

MR. THOMPSON: So move.

MR. LAPEYRE: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved by Mr. Thompson, seconded by Mr. Lapeyre. Those in favor, say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

THE CHAIRMAN: Opposed, no.

(No response)

The ayes have it. So ordered.

(The full text of the  
resolution is here made  
a part of the record.)

WHEREAS, the Louisiana Wild  
Life and Fisheries Commission has purchased property in New Iberia for the construction of a new field office, and

WHEREAS, for security purposes



a galvanized chain link fence was constructed around the property by Home Fence Company, Inc., of Lafayette, Louisiana, and

WHEREAS, Commission personnel have inspected the completed job for the construction of the fence and found it to be in compliance with the contract, with the cost of \$4,998.00,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Louisiana Wild Life and Fisheries Commission does hereby grant approval for the acceptance of the completion of the contract of the construction of the galvanized chain link fence by Home Fence Company, Inc., P. O. Box 2975, Lafayette, Louisiana, at the Commission-owned property, located on Darnell Road, off of Junction U. S. Highway 90, in New Iberia, Louisiana;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Director be and he is hereby



authorized and directed to sign any and all documents in connection therewith.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ted O'Neil.

MR. TED O'NEIL: Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Commission, I will start off by saying that we have a very active group here. We are going to talk about coons and coon hunting and coon legislation. I think you are aware of the problems we have had with our present coon law, with any kind of dog and two parties on the hunt, and they can go hunt and shoot in the marshes or anywhere else.

We have some tentative legislation proposed to discuss, but I think we first should show what the problem has been and what the problem is.

I have people here with the Enforcement Division and we are represented by some of the coastal landowners and we are represented by the associations, the Triangle Club Associations, which represent the trapper and the hunter, and we have the Coon Hunters Association represented here, the coon man that has very expensive dogs, imports coons, buys coons and is really a



conservation group and interested more in dogs and hunting. They are dog people, primarily, and coons secondarily, but they are a group that we must hear, that we must have before us here today.

First, I would like to call on our --

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to ask you something first, before you get started, Ted. This thing has come up many times and it has been so controversial and has covered so much time, do you reckon I ought to put a time limit on you and Jimmie?

MR. O'NEIL: A time limit?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, on you and Jimmie.

MR. O'NEIL: I think so and I believe that Jimmie and I are together.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, that opens it wide open. Let's go right ahead then.

MR. O'NEIL: I would like to first call on some of our enforcement people to discuss some of the problems they have had with this coon hunting law as it is today on our books. Who should I call on, Captain Hogan?

MR. MICHAEL HOGAN: Ray Montet.



MR. O'NEIL: Ray, would you come up?

MR. RAY MONTET: Mr. Chairman, Commission Members and Mr. Thompson --

THE CHAIRMAN: He tells me he and Jimmie are together, so let's not start anything!

MR. MONTET: Yes, sir. We want to keep him that way.

I am captain of twelve parishes in District Eight, the southeastern portion of Louisiana, and we have a tremendous problem here in District Eight with night hunting, trappers and coon hunters all getting together. Now, basically we have no -- not to my knowledge, let me put it this way -- no legitimate coon hunter organization in this district I can talk to or know of. We have a handful of coon hunters that legally and legitimately hunt coons. The rest of them are market hunters. They will use this coon act to get out and kill coons prior to the trapping season so they can sell pelts during the trapping season. Like right now, they are putting away hides now for next year's trapping season.

In '73 and '74 this District has made 62



in '73 and 71 in '74 coon cases. These are cases where we actually apprehended a man with a coon and he was hunting illegally. We made 239 night hunting cases. This is cases where they had no game. They were out there with a light and a gun. I would say half of these, 239 told us when we approached them that they were coon hunting, and when we asked them where their gun or either the dogs were, they said they were out just hunting, so we wrote them up for hunting at night. The ones that had coons, we wrote them up for hunting coons at night, and there were 61 of them.

Hunting nutria at night, 35. Hunting deer at night were 24, and hunting rabbits at night were 45, so yet the illegal coon hunter in this district still outnumbered any other illegal night hunter other than the hunter without any game. But then, like I said most of these hunters were coon hunters that didn't have any game.

Meeting with the trappers, ninety percent of your trappers want this law taken off the books, that a man can hunt coons. I don't agree with them. I think they should be limited. I



like the proposal that Mr. O'Neil has come up with. I would like to extend some of it. He says below Highway 90 or Intracoastal. I would like this to include the Atchafalaya Basin or part of it, that part that is in District Eight. There is no one in there that actually can get in there and hunt coons legally, according to law. They will get out there and hunt in a boat and they will get out there and hunt coons, especially in the Pierre Part area, and if Mr. Doyle Berry were here, Dr. Brownell over in Morgan City has called us a number of times on people commercializing on his raccoon in the Atchafalaya Basin area.

It is a big problem. The trappers are having problems. The landowners are complaining and I think that every effort should be made to restrict the coon hunter in some way other than what he is, particularly in this district.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Ted, you have someone else? I want to say this, Ted, this last sentence that I read down here, "Need regulation to allow legal harvest of daytime hunting," caused me to vote with this, because this is what my



friend Jimmie has been fighting for so long and I always thought he was correct but it never came to a vote. The Chair doesn't usually vote, but if it came up for a vote, I was going to vote, so my friend would know I was on his side.

MR. O'NEIL: Mr. Chairman, the statement made as to District Eight, that southeast district, that you are in, is that mostly swamp and marsh, and I think the statement to restrict coon hunting, maybe that is not what we mean. We are trying to adjust the coon hunting law so it can be controlled. It is not to stop coon hunting. I just wanted to get that in the record.

Now I would like to call on the Triangle T representative. Would you come up before the microphone and discuss your problems?

MR. HUGO SUCKOW: I am Hugo Suckow and I represent the Triangle T. I also am a member of the Clio Sportsmen's League and they are vitally concerned with this issue, too, but I was asked by the Triangle T to represent them this morning.

In our area we have had a terrific problem. Agents there say that it is impossible to



make a case because the men will go out, throw a dog in the boat, just anything that comes along. If he has even a chihuahua, he throws that in the boat and he can legally shine coons. He can kill as many as he can find. That they do, and they don't wait until the season, the trapping season, opens.

By the way, I am a commercial trapper and it does hurt when you see your neighbor go out, well, maybe in October, some of them maybe even earlier, killing these little old blue coons. I am sure that Mr. O'Neil will tell you that the value of that fur is not nearly what it would be if they would wait a couple of more months until the season opens. These men can and do go out and hunt from sundown until the sun comes up in the morning and they have, under the existing law, free rein to do this. Our agents say that it is almost impossible to make a case, and we would like to see something done that would change this.

Now we are not aiming at legitimate coon hunters. If he wants to run his dogs and enjoys running the dogs, this is not what we want. If we



can work out something where we can have these men hunt and enjoy their recreation and still have the coons fairly well protected, we are willing to go along with that.

Now, we had Mr. O'Neil and Mr. Lindstrom I believe it is, at the Clio meeting one night and they gave us a lot of information there and we found then they were pretty much in agreement with the way we feel, I believe.

That is about all I have to say, but we need something done.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. We are glad to get that input. One of the things I was thinking about, a man throws that chihuahua in his boat and has his headlight, if he saw a deer on the side of the bank, would he get him, too?

MR. SUCKOW: Well, I am sure most of them would.

MR. O'NEIL: I would like to call on a representative of the major marshland owners. LL&E has a group here. Who will speak for Louisiana Land?

MR. RENE RENDON: My name is Rene Rendon



of Louisiana Land. We have not come up here today to talk about the coon hunting problem, so I think you are confused. We are up here on these leg traps.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, if you don't mind then, let's get through with the coon hunting and then bring you back, please, sir.

MR. RENDON: Thank you.

(Inaudible comment from the floor.)

THE CHAIRMAN: We ought to get it on tape; I didn't hear that. I would like to hear from both sides, pro and con, but could I delay just a second.

Mr. Veillon, I notice you walked in and I want to introduce you to the crowd and ask you to introduce your guest.

MR. EDGAR VEILLON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have with me Mr. Bob Appel, who is the Regional Director for the National Wildlife Federation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Appel, very glad to have you.

MR. ROBERT APPEL: Thank you, sir. Glad



to be here.

MR. GERALD VOISIN: My name is Gerald Voisin. I represent the Louisiana Land and Exploration Company. The only thing I would like to add to the coon problem is that we have no coon hunting clubs per se in southeast Louisiana, and I thoroughly agree with Captain Montet that this coon business is being used as a tool to enable the hunter to get out there to shine deer and other animals at night. I do agree with some of the clubs that operate because I do know that the ones that are doing it legitimately are enforcing the law and not looking at violating the law. That is all I have.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir.

MR. O'NEIL: Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to call on one of our real coon club people, Mr. McPherson, who imports coons and has fine dogs. They are coon hunters, the kind that the law was originally set up for.

MR. ELLIS McPHERSON: I am Ellis McPherson. I represent the Southern Coon Hunters Association. I go along with the trappers here



and we are strictly not against them. Coon hunting in the state of Louisiana statewide is a problem. I know what you are talking about down in the south part. They have got big problems. I go along with this, a man shouldn't shoot a coon out of a boat or any moving vehicle, boat or whatever. He should be on foot. I go along with that. All the sportsmen coon hunters do. So with the trappers. Every trapper should mark with his name or number or something on it and in the summertime, come trapping season is over and his traps are still in the woods, he doesn't pick them up, it catches dogs, game, everything else. I think they go along with this.

Now the big point I want to get over and it is going to help the trappers, too, more than it is going to help us. Four months a year I push hard I push hard throughout the state and I tried hard last year to get them to pass something stiffer but I am told I won't get it across, so I will go with something lighter, to protect the coon population in the state of Louisiana. The more coons there are, the more fun we are going to



have, treeing them. We don't kill coons... I would like to say that here and now. We don't kill the coons out the trees that the dogs tree. We hunt for trophies and pleasure hunting. I would say in March, April and May there should be a no-kill season in the state of Louisiana. Let the man run his dogs. He is not going to hurt those coons. He is not going to catch them on the ground. I think I have got some of the best dogs in the world. Of course, that chihuahua has caused trouble here this morning! But I have never sold a gun hide; I have never sold a coon and it is not my living. I hunt for pleasure, so I would like if somebody could help me get that thing across, the four months across the state of Louisiana, and the problem down in south Louisiana, I have been hearing about it for a long time and they do have their hands full.

A lot of coon hunters are probably against me here today, but it has got to be stopped. People spend a lot of hours out there at night, chasing a man, and they finally catch him and he has got thirty or forty coons and he's got that chihuahua again with him and you have got to let



him go, the way the law reads now. I would like to see it changed myself, and all of the coon hunters in the state of Louisiana -- there are eight clubs -- they will within a year organize together and fight this thing and try to get something done.

That is about all I have. Thank you very much.

MR. THOMPSON: Your recommendation is a four-month season?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, his recommendation as I understood it, March, April and May, there would be a no-kill -- you could not kill a coon during March, April, May. Was that your recommendation?

MR. McPHERSON: March, April, May and June.

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, June. I left June out. June.

MR. McPHERSON: A no-kill season.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you didn't recommend they wouldn't be allowed to hunt; just not be allowed to kill them.

MR. McPHERSON: People running their dogs are not going to hurt them, anyway.



THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, but they would not be allowed to kill any coons caught since the session was over, any time --

MR. McPHERSON: Right. The big thing is protecting the trapper. A lot of these trappers, I tell you now, they make a living on these hides, not just in Louisiana but throughout all the other states. Like I told you, I grew up in north Louisiana and I will say this and go, but my mother used to go to the back door and throw out scraps and one of those dogs, it was a signal for a fair catch, so that tells you how poor I was.

MR. O'NEIL: I wonder if we have heard from everyone who wants to speak, other than our proposed legislation. Oh, we have one more.

MRS. VIRGINIA SUCKOW: I am Virginia Suckow; my husband just spoke a moment ago. I have been married to a commercial trapper for 32 years. My son is a commercial trapper, my son-in-law is, and I know quite a few of the problems we have.

What I would like to do along in with this suggestion of a four season no-kill, I would



also like to see a recommendation made into that law that if a hunter is found with, say, two, three, four or five coons, definitely no more than five, in his boat, you know that he is out hunting for the hides; he is not out for sport. Personally, I would like to see it two coons, myself, because if a man is hunting for sport and occasionally kills a coon, well, he is not going to kill over one or two, but if there are more coons than that in his boat, you know he is out for the money and he is going to be out any time of the year. He will even be violating this four-months no-kill season.

For that reason I would like to have this amendment tacked onto it. I thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, ma'am.

MR. O'NEIL: We have Greg here, our biologist, who has done a whole lot of work on this. He has been right on top of it and I think he should read some proposal that seems to be agreeable to both sides and all parties but it is still open for discussion, open for change. It is just a suggestion. Greg, would you come up and read our suggestions?



MR. GREG LINDSTROM: Greg Lindstrom with the Fur Division. Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, ladies and gentlemen, I want to re-emphasize what Ted said. These are possible alternatives for clarification and changes in the present law, and I am sure that some groups will not think this is restrictive enough. For example, you have heard from the Coon Hunters Association, and I know that they would like to see something a little bit more restrictive than this.

Presently the law reads: "Provided, that it shall be lawful for parties of two or more hunters with one or more dogs to hunt raccoons at night with lights and to carry on such hunts, for the purpose of taking raccoons, no more than one standard .22 caliber, rim fire rifle, and to use single ball rim fire ammunition only."

To eliminate hunting out of boats and vehicles, we suggest one of the two possible amendments to the law, by adding on something similar to this: "It shall be unlawful to take, attempt to take or share for raccoon from a boat or a vehicle."



Another possible wording: "It shall be unlawful to take, attempt to take or shine for raccoon except on foot and with the aid of a dog."

Additionally, we would recommend that the present law be amended, requiring that the Commission set a daytime season, including bag limits, on the raccoon. We feel like that we have a problem now because a lot of squirrel hunters probably are taking coons illegally and leaving them in the woods, whereas if we could make it legal and allow a reasonable bag limit, we would have a better utilization of the resource.

No. 3, we would recommend that the law be amended by eliminating nighttime raccoon hunting in coastal Louisiana, that area south of the Intracoastal Waterway.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. THOMPSON: Let me get an interpretation. Are you saying, where you are applying to the daytime coon hunting, that it would not be required to have a dog and it could be shot with something other than a .22 rifle and that there would not have to be two in the party?



MR. LINDSTROM: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: O. K., Mr. O'Neil.

MR. O'NEIL: I think we should get a resolution from the Board, approving this legislation, and try to get concurrence tonight from the Federation in their workshop to adjust -- that would be the period to adjust the legislation, before it goes to the committee. If we could get approval of the Board on this proposal, I think it would do nearly everything that everyone here wants to do but that is not the end of it, because we still would like to go through the Federation meeting tonight or tomorrow and make adjustments, leave it open for adjustments.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would like this to be a little more final and a little more concrete before I would give approval.

MR. THOMPSON: How many coon bag limit?

MR. O'NEIL: I would like to keep the bag limit to two or three.

MR. THOMPSON: Won't work.

MR. O'NEIL: For instance, the squirrel hunters I don't believe will want to kill over one



or two coons, a man squirrel hunting. I know I did hunt this year and I watched that very closely. I was in good coon country and I hunted a good deal. I killed 45, 50 squirrels, and I saw only one coon that I could have shot if I had wanted to, an old sleepy coon crawling up a tree. I don't see many coons. I don't know how the other squirrel hunters feel about that, but I only see a few.

MR. THOMPSON: Well, Ted, I recognize the fact that you don't see many coons. If you see a coon, you generally see him in the fork of a tree, but lots of times you will see a little colony of coons. I would rather see you increase that to five. What you are really saying, and I hate to tell this on you, you've got old and won't track that many out!

MR. O'NEIL: That has a lot to do with it. I tried that one time. (Laughter)

MR. THOMPSON: But I think probably five, because if you get a man in a position where there is a colony of coons and they are in the tree and he does kill more than two, two would be a little restrictive. Bear in mind, I go along with you, I



know what your thinking is, but I think five is a fair number.

A lot of people eat coons. I don't particularly eat them. I have tried them, but a lot of people eat coons and if they get a chance to kill more than two coons, they probably are going to kill them, hunters. They are doing it now, doing it today, so I would like to see you increase that to five, a minimum of five.

MR. DUPUY: I think the limit is academic, anyway.

MR. SUCKOW: I would like to answer his question. Well, I would like to contradict him. If you are going to limit to five or more, we are going to soon be back in the same spot we are in now, because if there is a colony of coons in there and this squirrel hunter goes in there and he finds them, why couldn't he kill a couple of it, and the next time he goes hunting, they are going to be in that same area, most likely, and he can get him a couple more.

If we get that limit too high -- now, I am not against the sportsman, but I think that the



Good Lord put the stuff here first of all, not for the sportsman, not that I have anything against him because I love to hunt, myself, but He put it there primarily for the use of the people, and when we are making our living at it, now if you have got a bunch of guys that are plugging around there, killing five or even more, you know they can get a good many. If it is for sport, why not keep it down to a sportsman's limit. How many rabbits do you kill? What is it? About eight, something like that?

MR. YANCEY: Eight.

MR. THOMPSON: O. K., I would go along with eight.

MR. SUCKOW: Well, I am sure you would. I may be looking at it from a selfish angle, but I am sure there are a lot of people feel the same way I do. We are making our living at this sort of thing and we don't mind sharing it to a certain extent but we don't want to take and give all of our living away. You know, there is a lot of hunting pressure today, and there is more every year.

MR. THOMPSON: I guess I am going to hurt



you then, because what you said did sound selfish to me because you do want to kill a whole lot of coons and you do want to make your living out of it, but I would have to disagree with you. I don't in principle. What you were probably trying to say or fixing to say was that if you kill the whole colony of coons, there wouldn't be anything left for reproduction out of that one colony. Wasn't that what you were intimating, if you kill them all at one time?

MR. SUCKOW: Right now, let me say, I don't think we are in any danger of depleting the coon population, but they are becoming more valuable within the last couple of years. I have sold the meat I brought in and, well, in most cases the meat brought me more money than the pelt did. It's becoming valuable. There are a lot of people learning this. There are a lot of school kids set a few traps. A lot of men that I know that took a leave of absence from their job, took an early vacation, so that they could get that first couple of weeks of the trapping season, which, as every trapper knows, is when the cream of the crop is taken because



of the pressure that comes.

Now in our area, I would love to find a place where I could trap some leased land, where I would be more or less protected, but in our area there is none of that. It is free trapping and, boy, I will tell you, everyone comes in. After two weeks of this season, we had most of our season's work made because of the pressure.

THE CHAIRMAN: I believe Mr. Dupuy had some input.

MR. DUPUY: Ted, your recommendations did not include a no-kill in March, April, May and June, but what do you think of that?

MR. O'NEIL: I think it's real good. I think it's all right but we will have a problem. We will have a permit problem with the corn man a little later. We are going to have to make some adjustment for the coon going into a corn patch and tearing up the whole corn patch.

MR. DUPUY: Crop depredation?

MR. O'NEIL: Crop depredation. And, back on the subject, Jimmie, we really could set, unless we want to try to settle it here, we could wait



until the bag limit, the Alexandria meeting, and set bag limits.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, I think we have to have this in a more concrete form, itemize this. I think we have gotten the major ideas over today. I would suggest, Ted, that you work this thing up into the form of a legislative act or rules and regulations, setting bag limits and so forth, for our consideration at the next meeting or at the Alexandria meeting.

I had a gentleman that wanted to speak and since we have a rather long agenda and we have some other things to go to, we are going to have to --

MR. DUPUY: Clay, before you leave the coon subject, if we are going to have legislation, we will be talking about mid-April, so we need to do it real soon.

THE CHAIRMAN: That's right. I would say by the next meeting. We have another meeting two weeks away.

MR. THOMPSON: Let me make a statement then. I will make the motion if I am in order, but



let me just say by way of clarifying, we are talking about coon hunting in one aspect. Now I hope, and I know all of my colleagues up here are aware of the situation, particularly Marc Dupuy, who is an avid quail hunter or fosters the quail movement, coons have a far-reaching effect. They have a monetary standpoint, from your particular deal. There are a lot of coon hunters that I know of who hunt coons at night strictly for the purpose of sale. The coon, on the other side of the ledger, is a destroyer of quail eggs and the habitat. They are egg-eaters, so they have a detrimental point. We have an abundance of coon, and with our present laws, even with our present laws, it hasn't been indicated to me -- someone can correct me in our biological department if I am wrong -- that our coons are on the increase rather than the decrease, even with our laws that we have today. I don't mean that I wouldn't go along with this south of 190, but there are more aspects to this thing than just meet the eye here.

For instance, our coon hunters associations bring in coons and they have the coon on the



log and all this and I am well aware of it and I attend a lot of the hunts, but this thing is far-reaching. It is not just one little aspect that we are sitting up here, trying to sit in judgment on, so to speak. So, I would like to make the motion, as presented --

THE CHAIRMAN: Hold it, Jimmie. I promised Mr. McPherson I would let him speak just a few minutes ago.

MR. McPHERSON: I won't take much of your time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Go right ahead, sir. Speak loudly.

MR. McPHERSON: I am strictly against the coon on the log, so when you said "coon on the log" you were looking directly at me. I went to one in my life, about ten years ago, and that done it. I am strictly against it. It's outlawed. That's against the law, coon on the log.

I am with the sportsmen coon hunters, to back him up agin the trapper. I will go along with this, too. Now those coons, when you are squirrel hunting out there -- I squirrel hunt as much as



anybody and I love it; that's about all I do, squirrel hunting and coon hunt for pleasure. If you are going to find four and five coons in a tree, that's a litter. Those coons are not just wandering from somewhere else. That's a family of coons right there. You can kill them in you want to. I would recommend two, but I know the sportsmen throughout the state of Louisiana, at several meetings I have been to in the last eight months, have recommended two. It doesn't matter to me one way or the other. I am for the whole state of Louisiana, not part of it, because I hunt in other states, too, and on these competition hunts, we don't kill the coon. We don't kill a coon nowhere we hunt. There are four men out there, four dogs and a judge. He will not have a gun; he can't carry a gun in the woods with him, so he can't kill a coon. If he does, he will be fined, by our club, not by the state.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Now, Jimmie, to push this thing along, I am ready for your motion.

MR. THOMPSON: I want to go home, too, but



by golly, this is business that needs to be talked about, and I just demand to talk about it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am ready for your motion.

MR. THOMPSON: I'm not ready to give my motion; I want to argue a little bit.

THE CHAIRMAN: I recognize you.

MR. THOMPSON: I agree with you in one aspect. I know what your position is, but it is just like fighting chickens. I happen to like to go to a chicken fight. I know there's not ten people in here that like them, but I happen to, so that's my likes and dislikes. I am not a coon hunter, so I am sitting here with an impartial standpoint. I go to coon hunts because I am invited in Rapides Parish and I go because I know all the fellows. It is just like fox hunting; I go because I like to shoot the bull with them. In fact, when they all go to lying down in their sleeping bags and everything, I go home; I don't stay and help them hunt their dogs the next day.

But we have got to consider this thing from every point, and you have to look at the



other side of it. There's not a man in here that's a sportsman or a hunter that goes in the woods that doesn't know of people that have a job, schoolboys, they go hunting for coons and sell those coons, not as a commercial coon hunter, not as a trapper; they may even waste the hide. I am not saying this but these coons are sold in every market in every little town where there's coon territory. I am saying that there are bad things about coons. Some people say we ought to eliminate them. Marc thinks they ought to eliminate them completely. I am not putting those words in your mouth, I know that, but he has fostered the quail program and they are detrimental to the quail program.

In fact, I make the motion that we go along exactly as Ted has presented it, with a minimum of five in the bag limit for the sports hunter.

MRS. SUCKOW: With a minimum or a maximum?

MR. THOMPSON: Minimum. They don't ever want to get boxed plumb in.

MRS. SUCKOW: No, but you give them a minimum and then they have got free rein.



MR. THOMPSON: No, ma'am. I said I am going along -- no, ma'am, you misinterpreted me. I said a minimum. In other words, they may want to put six. It's O. K. with me. I am not restricting them, but I want a minimum of five in the law.

MR. SUCKOW: They may want to put 25, too.

MR. THOMPSON: Well, if there is enough power and pressure and there is enough people on their side that they can get 25 passed, then that is what it will have to be. If you put enough pressure that there be none, then there will be none, but I want to say that I make that motion as a minimum.

THE CHAIRMAN: Restate your motion, Jimmie, and I will ask for a second.

MR. THOMPSON: I would like to make the motion exactly as printed here, the recommendations that Ted spoke of over the microphone, spelling out the fact that there would be a minimum of five coons in the bag limit.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right, you have heard the motion. Do I have a second?

MR. O'NEIL: I am leaving that up to



Jimmie and the coon hunters. I don't believe I said let's put a minimum of five.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, Jimmie amended it. Ted, just a minute. No one said that. Jimmie simply amended your recommendation to include five. I didn't ask for your concurrence since yours is not a resolution, simply a recommendation, and we didn't have to have your concurrence.

Now, let me ask, do I have a second to this motion, as stated by Mr. Thompson, including the amendment to Mr. Ted O'Neil's recommendations? Do I have a second? I will second it. Now we will have a vote. Any man has a right to have his amendment voted on.

Now, I am going to have to go a little further than that. I am going to call for a voice vote. How do you vote, Don Wille?

MR. WILLE: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: How do you vote, Jimmie Thompson?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair votes yes. How do you vote, Mr. Dupuy?



MR. DUPUY: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: How do you vote, Mr. Lapeyre?

MR. LAPEYRE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Three to two.

MR. DUPUY: The issue was only the number of coons; there wasn't any issue about the recommendations.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is carried three to two. So ordered.

MR. O'NEIL: Mr. Chairman, I have one other --

THE CHAIRMAN: Now is it related to coons?

MR. O'NEIL: No, it is not, but it is related to the leg-hold trap.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right, sir. We will give you a short time. I still think I was right, folks, when I said I should limit these two people.

MR. WILLE: Mr. Chairman, may I be recognized?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. Just a minute.

MR. WILLE: I would entertain to put in another motion here.



THE CHAIRMAN: You mean a substitute motion?

MR. WILLE: A substitute motion on this coon -- or another motion, the same motion that Jimmie made with the proviso in there that we do set the limits on this thing when we have our regular meeting where we do this.

MR. YANCEY: That is customary.

MR. WILLE: Pardon?

MR. YANCEY: That is customary to set the bag limits on resident game. We do this every year, on deer and so on.

THE CHAIRMAN: That will be discussed in the Alexandria meeting. However, the motion as passed here would not prevent the Commission from changing the bag limits at any time, am I correct?

MR. YANCEY: You set them every year.

THE CHAIRMAN: I know we set them every year, but I mean it wouldn't prevent us from changing the --

MR. WILLE: Maybe I didn't make myself clear. The only reason I am asking for this, Mr. Chairman, is that these people that are trappers



have an opportunity to come up to Alexandria. There may be two here today. He may be able to bring some more up in force. He may be able to sway the Commission as to limiting the bag limit on it to a small bag limit. Now I am on his side, and, of course, we got voted down on this thing, but I still think that they should have an opportunity to plead their case again, this minimum of five coons. Even though I am a quail hunter myself, Jimmie, and I would like to see the coons, you know, brought down myself, but I definitely think that to give them a fair shake and give them a chance to get themselves organized, that we should say that we will set our bag limits at the meeting in Alexandria.

THE CHAIRMAN: O. K., Mr. Wille. Let me make a statement, and then I will recognize you, Jimmie, for counter debate.

The Chair would have to recognize another motion and if you care to make a motion and can get it seconded, then, of course, the Chair will recognize you, but let me recognize Jimmie now.

MR. THOMPSON: Well, let me do this. I



have just thought of something. I wasn't thinking. I wasn't very sharp. Suppose we had a die-off of coons and our coons got to a distressed number and we had a five minimum on it. I can see where we would be in a jam. It is too late now to delete that from the motion, but I would like to make a substitute motion now, deleting my motion, saying that we have a minimum of five.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, you are not deleting the entire -- let me get this straight -- you are not deleting the entire motion; you are deleting the amendment to Mr. O'Neil's recommendations.

MR. THOMPSON: Right, correct. Do you want me to read the thing?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, no, I have it.

MR. DUPUY: I will second that.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion before the Board at this time is by Mr. Thompson that we adopt the recommendations of Mr. Ted O'Neil in relation to the coon hunting regulations and with the deletion of his amendment of a minimum of five coons. Do I have a second to that motion?

MR. DUPUY: I have seconded it.



THE CHAIRMAN: All right, we have a second by Mr. Dupuy. Those in favor, say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

THE CHAIRMAN: Opposed, no.

(No response)

All right.. The second motion has it and it is so ordered. The amendment of Mr. Thompson's motion striking out from your recommendations the minimum of five coons, leaving to the Commission the duty of setting the limit at its regular limit-setting meeting. Thank you, Mr. O'Neil.

MR. O'NEIL: Now, while I am here, we have --

THE CHAIRMAN: You will make it brief?

MR. O'NEIL: Yes, very brief. We still have groups, mostly New York and California based, that are doing everything they can to prevent the use of the leghold trap. They have taken a few states each year and they are putting in federal legislation every year that would curtail the use of the leghold trap. We thought that it had finally stopped, but I see they are gaining states. Every year there is one or two more states fall to this.



Louisiana just can't live under such legislation, and we have been able to have it put in committees, in commercial committees in Washington, where it would be killed or left to die.

Now in 1973 we passed a resolution against any such legislation, the Board did, and we have it here. Now there are two or three more vicious bills in Washington recently. They keep putting them in. I don't know how long it will go. It looks like it will go forever. We have Mr. Rene Renden here, representing LL&E, who must trap animals to prevent erosion and to continue the livelihood of people. Would you like to hear his resolution?

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have a resolution prepared for our adoption, Mr. O'Neil?

MR. O'NEIL: Yes, and he would like to speak briefly.

MR. RENE RENDEN: Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Commission, I am Rene Renden, representing Louisiana Land & Exploration Company. I have prepared, after consultation with the Wild Life and Fisheries, a resolution concerning the



several bills pending in the federal Congress, which in effect would outlaw the use of leghold traps. Now, I am not going to belabor the point. Mr. Ted O'Neil and his staff would clearly indicate that the only feasible means of trapping fur-bearing animals in Louisiana, especially in the marsh country, would be the leghold trap and not the traps designed to kill instantly the animals being trapped.

With your permission, I would like to present Mr. Gerald Voisin, who is in charge of our marshland department, to give you a very brief outline on the effects of this type of legislation on the fur trapping industry in Louisiana. Mr. Voisin.

MR. GERALD VOISIN: My name is Gerald Voisin, Louisiana Land and Exploration Company.

To really sum this thing up in just a few words, if we lose this leghold trap, we are out of business. We have a dead industry, which is fur trapping in the state of Louisiana, which is an industry in itself and a big industry. The amount of pressure that is being put on us from



these humane groups has got to the point where we really need to do something about it and do it fast. The main objective, I think, of trying to pass this resolution is to make our Congressmen aware of what is going on and see if we can step in this thing firsthand.

I would like for Mr. Renden to read the resolution.

MR. RENDEN: (Reading) The Louisiana Wild Life and Fisheries Commission Resolution:

WHEREAS, the State of Louisiana historically has had a valuable furbearing resource and trapping was and continues to be an economic asset to this state and its citizens engaged in trapping for their livelihood; and

WHEREAS, trapping is used in this state as a tool of scientific wildlife management to harvest surpluses of furbearing animals that would otherwise endanger public health and safety, or deleteriously affect the marsh ecosystem by endangering other wildlife inhabiting



the same, or present a threat to private property, such as poultry and domestic livestock, and ultimately destroy the furbearing species in Louisiana marshes; and

WHEREAS, the composition of the vegetation comprising the Louisiana marshes, and the fluctuation of water levels over the same are such that only leghold or steel jaw traps are mechanically feasible to assure successful trapping of furbearing animals; and

WHEREAS, traps of a mechanical design different from leghold or steel jaw traps have indisputably proven unsatisfactory for trapping in this state because of marsh vegetation composition and water level fluctuation; and

WHEREAS, trappers in this state must check their traps on a daily basis to assure success in pursuit of their trapping livelihood,



and thereby do not expose trapped fur-bearing animals to needless prolonged suffering; and

WHEREAS, House Bills H. R. 66 and H. R. 134, and Senate Bill S. 1637, have been introduced into the United States Congress, which if enacted into law would prohibit the use of leghold or steel jaw traps in the United States and thereby preclude trapping from being successfully practiced in this state as a tool of scientific wildlife management and impose severe economic hardships on Louisiana citizens engaged in trapping for their livelihood,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Louisiana Wild Life and Fisheries Commission, as the duly constituted agency of the State of Louisiana for the purpose of protecting, conserving and replenishing the wildlife of this state, supports the use of trapping as a tool of scientific wildlife management.



and the use of leghold or steel jaw traps in Louisiana as the only practical means of implementing scientific wildlife management of furbearing animals in this state through trapping; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Louisiana Wildlife and Fisheries Commission opposes the enactment of United States Congressional House Bills H. R. 66 and H. R. 134, and Senate Bill S. 1637, into law of the United States; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that copies of this resolution, duly certified in accordance with the practice of this Commission, be presented to all members of the Louisiana Congressional delegation representing the citizens of this state.

Thank you, gentlemen.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir. You have heard the reading of the resolution. Is there any discussion by the Board members?



MR. DUPUY: I would like to move adoption.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved by Mr. Dupuy.

MR. WILLE: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: Seconded by Mr. Wille. Those in favor, say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

THE CHAIRMAN: Opposed, no.

(No response)

The Chair rules that the resolution is adopted and we recommend to our staff that it be carried out. Thank you.

Mr. Yancey, I believe we are ready for you now.

MR. RICHARD YANCEY: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Commission, we have three items on the agenda that pertain to the Commission's land acquisition program. This is simply a continuation of this program that involves the purchase of land for enlarging the Commission's wildlife management areas program.

If you will recall, about two months ago the Commission was offered 2,530 acres of land in



Richland Parish by Stuart Hunt of Dallas, Texas. Now this particular tract of land -- here, hold one side of this map -- lies immediately adjoining the east boundary of the existing Commission-owned Russell Sage Wildlife Management Area. This is the city of Monroe (indicating), located about six miles to the west of this particular tract of land.

This land is all in bottomland hardwoods. It is an excellent game range and it would make a fine addition to the game management area, and it has good populations of deer, squirrel, rabbit and some turkey, and even raccoons, and so we feel it would complement the game management area and we have had it appraised. In discussions with Hunt, the land will sell for \$290 per acre.

We would like to recommend that the Commission authorize us to proceed with the purchase of this land. Of course, this will involve signing of an agreement to sell. It will involve obtaining title insurance. It will involve getting the necessary approval through the Division of Administration. It will also involve signature by the Governor in the purchase of this property. We



do have funds available for the purchase. We would like to recommend that we proceed with this as rapidly as possible.

THE CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, you have heard the recommendation. Do I have a motion?

MR. THOMPSON: So move.

MR. WILLE: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: Moved by Mr. Thompson, seconded by Mr. Wille. Those in favor, say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

THE CHAIRMAN: Opposed, no.

(No response)

So ordered. Next item, Mr. Yancey.

MR. YANCEY: At the January meeting it was brought to the attention of the Commission that a 5,500-acre tract of land in St. John the Baptist Parish was being offered to the Commission for a price of \$150 per acre and the Commission authorized that we proceed with an appraisal of this property. At that time it was pointed out that this land is marshland that joins on Lake Pontchartrain for a distance of about five miles. It joins Pass Manchac for a distance of approximately



three miles. It is located about three miles east of Highway 51 and about halfway between LaPlace and Pontchatoula. In conducting some wildlife surveys in the area, it is real good waterfowl habitat. We found two or three thousand ducks on the property when we took a look at it in early February. Of course, it is productive of all forms of wetland or marsh wildlife that you find in this particular part of the state.

Now, since that time, the Commission authorized the appraisal and the Division of Administration employed Mr. Russell Doiron, an MAI in Baton Rouge, to appraise it, and he has completed his appraisal. It appraised for \$155 per acre, which is \$5 above the price that it is being offered to the Commission.

We had the Commission engineer, working with Dewey Wills here, examine the acreage of the property. We found that some of it had eroded away into Lake Pontchartrain and the actual acreage at this time is 5,261 acres, which is about 240 acres less than the sellers thought they had. Dewey met with Mr. Kostmayer and representatives of



the Schlieder Foundation, and they have agreed that this is in fact the actual acreage.

We would like to recommend at this time that the Commission approve of going ahead and working out all the details that have to be accomplished in order to purchase this property, but before you make a motion on this I think we have people here that want to make some comments about this acquisition. I believe that Representative Dennis Hebert of Tangipahoa Parish is here and wants to offer some comments, and perhaps there may be others that want to comment.

We had some people in Hammond who had occupied a camp on this property for a number of years who were interested in buying the camp and the land that the camp sits on from the Foundation, and I believe that this is the main topic that would be up for discussion at this time. Mr. Hebert, Mr. Chairman, I believe would like to be heard at this time. He is a member of the legislature from Tangipahoa Parish.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hebert, I want to apologize. I always recognize our state legislators



when they come to the meeting but I didn't know you.

REPRESENTATIVE DENNIS HEBERT: No apology needed, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Next time you are here, hold up your hand and I will be very happy to recognize you. Thank you, sir.

MR. HEBERT: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, ladies and gentlemen, my time here today is going to be very short. I would like to ask you to consider postponing action on this certain project today until your next meeting. We have had a few problems with some of the people in my area on this situation, and I would like to get it cleared up. I feel like asking you to wait two weeks would not be too much, and I think we could work out something where everyone would be happy with the project. I am 100 percent for the project but I just would like a little time, if it is possible.

I know you folks are very busy and I know that you have a lot to take up at each of your meetings. I want to congratulate you and



commend you for the fine way you have handled yourselves this morning. At this time I would like, if it doesn't put any burden on anyone, it would help us out in our area very much. I have had a few people call me on it besides these gentlemen back here, and some other people called me on some other things they are concerned about, and I would like to ask you at this time to let me at least get back with them and check with them and give me this time. Probably two weeks would be enough.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hebert, let me give you a thought there.

MR. HEBERT: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: In my experience in the few years I have been here with the Commission, if we went to work tomorrow and worked diligently, we would be thirty days before we would take final action and you well would have your twenty days. Mr. Yancey, we would like to hear from you. Mr. Kostmayer I believe wants to be heard.

MR. DUPUY: I would like to ask before you retire --

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.



MR. DUPUY: We won't run the risk of losing this purchase by a delay, will we?

MR. HEBERT: I feel, since I am in the real estate business, too, and I am not up here pushing on it, I feel that there is no danger of losing this land by waiting two weeks extra. No, sir, I don't think, because I think there is a lot of land in this area, and I am sure Mr. Kostmayer will agree with me on it, that two weeks won't hurt. I don't believe it will jeopardize the program.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kostmayer, I know that your comments are important enough that I would like to have them recorded, so will you come to the mike, please?

MR. M. D. KOSTMAYER, JR.: Mr. Chairman, Commission Members, I am M. D. Kostmayer, Jr., Kostmayer Mortgage Corporation. I represent the Schlieder Foundation.

The question of a sale on the part of Schlieder Foundation of any part of this property has been discussed in the past. I will give you a little history on this thing. This Foundation is



rigidly supervised by federal authorities and under pressure from the federal authorities, they decided some time ago that this asset must be disposed of because it is not generating the minimum income that the federal people put as a test. At that particular time we discussed the possibility of private sale or sale to this body. The board of directors at that time determined that for many reasons they could not entertain a private sale.

Now the Schlieder Foundation has before it today an offer to purchase this property, or a piece of it, I should say, the camphouse and so forth, and that either is or has been politely rejected for the reason that there are other individual offers for several times the amount that the old tenants offered. I am here to say that I will ask you not to accede to Representative Hebert's request. They have signed a purchase agreement in good faith. They have written the Hammond group a letter and we have a copy for your records, stating that under no circumstances can they consider a sale to an individual, for the reasons that I just mentioned.



I will be glad to answer any questions. I don't mean to be hard but this has been considered for months and months by Schlieder in good faith. They gave to you a purchase agreement which they expect to be accepted today.

Are there any questions, Mr. Chairman?

THE CHAIRMAN: I have no questions. Perhaps some of the Board members might.

MR. LAPEYRE: Would it actually jeopardize the negotiations?

MR. KOSTMAYER: I have ten men on that board. They are prominent men that came to you in good faith and I can't answer that question, because I am not on the board and everything is done by resolution. I can say to you that this was discussed in the past and rejected. In my meeting with them this week with Dewey Wills, they understood that this thing would be acted on today. Now, you are fooling with ten men, and I would not predict that.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I think possibly I can make a motion that will solve, not necessarily the problem, but would make both the



gentlemen happy. I would like to move that we accept this offer as presented, with the option of the Schlieder Corporation to delete any lands, maximum of fifty acres, that they so choose, if they choose, before this sale is consummated.

MR. KOSTMAYER: Would you rephrase that, please, Jimmie? I am tryin to follow you close.

MR. THOMPSON: I am just giving the Schlieder Corporation the opportunity if they so desire to delete a small portion of land, if they so desire.

MR. KOSTMAYER: Well, Jimmie, let me explain something to you. I have a purchase agreement here that is signed, and I am limited as to what I and what you can do. Now if you accept that, you would have to modify it, insert these conditions and I am not an attorney but I have got enough training in business to know that if this thing is going to be wrapped up, there can't be any conditions then. Otherwise, I have got to go back to this board. Restate it, please.

MR. THOMPSON: All right. I want to move that we accept the offer. Then if you want,



if you wish, I will make another motion, someone can or I will, that in the event your corporation so chooses before this sale is consummated that a small portion of land could be deleted.

MR. KOSTMAYER: Well, I would like to suggest that if you accept the offer that there be no conditions, and by a second resolution, if you want to, that might be done.

MR. THOMPSON: O. K.

MR. KOSTMAYER: But we must place in the record for your purposes a letter which has been delivered to Mr. Yancey which absolutely precludes any consideration --

MR. THOMPSON: Dewese, all I am really doing is --

MR. KOSTMAYER: I understand and I think it is a good compromise. I think as long as it is two recommendations and it doesn't interfere with the legal documents we have, we are fine.

THE CHAIRMAN: I recognize Mr. Hebert.

MR. HEBERT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Of course, I like what Mr. Thompson said a few minutes ago on another bill, another resolution



brought before you; he doesn't like to be put in a box and I don't, either; as a legislator, and I am sure you gentlemen don't, either. It seems like here, you know, I agree with the gentleman 100 percent; he is trying to put you in a box, really, and say this is going to be it and you either accept it or not. I don't know how you gentlemen feel but I don't like to be put in that position. I like the offer that you did make, Mr. Thompson.

MR. THOMPSON: Well, I will make that motion.

MR. HEBERT: I think it would take care of our situation, if we can get it corrected. And I want to say this, too, that today I am just more or less speaking for these gentlemen here, but I have had some other people call me pertaining to this area and they are not happy about it, from my area that I represent, so I would also like to ask for this time so I can go back and talk to them and see what problems they have. You know, if I have a problem, it may not seem very important to someone else, but it is important to me, and that is the same way with these people I represent, you



see, so I would like to go back, and I think two weeks is not -- I don't think you are going to blow any deal in two weeks. I sincerely believe that. If you would permit me, I would like to ask Mr. Conrad Anderson, who is the gentleman back here with me, if he would come up and I think he has something to say, Mr. Chairman, if you would recognize him, please, sir. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, would you state your name, please?

MR. CONRAD ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman and Board Members, my name is Conrad Anderson from Hammond, Louisiana, a member of the Turtle Cove Hunting and Fishing Club. The Turtle Cove Hunting and Fishing Club has been in existence since 1952. We are asking only approximately five acres out of this total 5,500 acres. We have two camps on this location. Since 1952 we have tried to be good conservationists. Out of our own pocket we have policed the area and have tried to maintain good conservation. This and this only is what we are asking for, for the Commission to consider our request to have this small portion of the total



acreage be set aside where we can continue to enjoy the good life that we have done in the past, and this alone. Thank you, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, sir, I agree with your point of view but, on the other hand, I think you have got to agree with our point of view that we must not do anything that would cause us to lose the purchase of this land.

MR. ANDERSON: Well, certainly not, sir. I think it is a wonderful, wonderful venture that you gentlemen are about ready to entertain. It is only that we as a small group of fifteen people that have been there since 1952 are only asking that if we could have some consideration from the Commission to set aside the five acres.

Now, the five acres are on the north perimeter and would be of absolutely no detriment to the total acreage. Had the camp been located in the center or in some area inaccessible where we would have to come across state land to get to it, then that would be another question, but it sits right on Pass Manchac and we would like to be good neighbors. Thank you.



THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir. Mr. Yancey.

MR. YANCEY: Well, as pointed out earlier, at this time we do not have this property tied up with a formal agreement to sell or purchase, and I am a little bit confused at this point as to when we will be able to go ahead and execute this agreement with this motion that we just adopted. Mr. Hebert I believe asked that no action be taken for two weeks in connection with the signing of this, so I --

THE CHAIRMAN: We haven't adopted the motion yet, I don't believe, have we, Dick?

MR. YANCEY: Well, I thought that you did.

THE CHAIRMAN: He has one that he is going to propose but I haven't called for the motion or the second yet. We are discussing it, though.

MR. LAPEYRE: Dick, I am sorry I missed your comments there. Would you repeat them, please?

MR. THOMPSON: I am sorry, I apologize. I was talking.

MR. YANCEY: Well, we do not have this property tied up now with a formal agreement, a signed agreement, to purchase, and I was just asking



for some clarification as to at what point would we be in a position to have this done, executed.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am quite concerned myself.

MR. KOSTMAYER: I want to correct Dick. I am not practicing law. This property is tied up right this instant. I have this signed purchase agreement but I am not telling you it is worth a darn if you don't accept it today. This is the point. It is a set-up for procedure, formal procedure, today, but it is tied up.

Now, the other thing is, I think we have no resolution. Jimmie made a suggestion -- correct me, you suggested, Jimmie that we accept this thing and by another resolution you give the right to Schlieder if they so elect to dispose of a small portion of it, is that right? O. K., sir.

MR. THOMPSON: We are going to make it just exactly like it is but yet I am going to -- well, that's it exactly.

THE CHAIRMAN: You said, if I understand the thing correctly, and I need to understand it also, Jimmie --



MR. THOMPSON: All right, let me make the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just a second. If I understand correctly, you are going to move that we accept this offer as it is offered today but we give the --

MR. THOMPSON: No, no, I am just going to move that we accept it as presented.

THE CHAIRMAN: And leave out your provision?

MR. THOMPSON: No, I am going to come back with that, with another.

THE CHAIRMAN: O. K., I see, I understand now.

MR. THOMPSON: I am going to keep from making any legal -- Marc can answer this better than anyone. I don't think I would jeopardize this sale at all -- or I may not even make the motion; someone else may make the motion. But let's buy the land right now. I would like to make a motion, Mr. Chairman, that we accept the offer as presented.

MR. WILLE: I second that.

THE CHAIRMAN: I still have a request for



discussion. I can grant you --

MR. HEBERT: Mr. Chairman, I hate to take all of your time today, but I feel that two weeks, and I don't want to take and belabor the point too much, but I feel like two weeks, you are not really taking a great chance on losing this property. I think you were first approached in the January meeting. Is this right? So you haven't been studying it for months and months, so what I feel like here is two weeks, I don't believe you would put your project in jeopardy. I just don't believe that. I believe Mr. Yancey would agree with me on that.

Now I spoke to Mr. Angelle just before the meeting today. Of course, he said, he gave you gentlemen all the credit and said there was no way that he would even try to ask you to do anything, but he did tell me on the phone that he would not mind having to delay the other deal, for your resolution, to get it straightened up. This is why I am saying this, as the gentleman told me on the phone.

What I am saying here is that I know a



program has been worked out and I am a hundred percent for the program and I will vote for the program, but I just ask you if you would to wait two weeks, until your next meeting, to officially sign the deal and so forth. I think most of our people in our immediate area, in the Manchac and the Pontchatoula and Hammond area, would be for this project. They are 100 percent for it other than a few, and I would like to get that time to go back and talk to these few people and see if we can't change them over.

MR. THOMPSON: Well, I made a motion and it has been seconded. I think if you will bear with us, we are giving you just what you want; we are making both of you happy.

MR. HEBERT: Mr. Thompson, I have seen some cases, and I hope this Board is not that way, where there are two votes and sometimes the first one will pass and then the second resolution may die, you see. This is what I am trying to do. I don't want to see that happen.

MR. THOMPSON: Have faith! Have faith!

MR. HEBERT: I do, sir, but --



MR. THOMPSON: I am going to call for the question. I think you are going to win.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now you are moving, Jimmie. I have not called for the motion and I haven't called to recognize the second, but I do now call for the motion and declare that debate is over with, since he has called for the question. Now, Jimmie, I am ready for your motion. The Chair is ready for your motion.

MR. THOMPSON: I have already made it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you restate it?

MR. THOMPSON: Restate it? It has been moved that we accept this proposition as presented.

THE CHAIRMAN: Correct. All right, the Chair accepts the motion. Now, Mr. Wille, you seconded?

MR. WILLE: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: Seconded by Mr. Wille. Those in favor, say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

THE CHAIRMAN: Opposed, no.

(No response)

The ayes have it. It is so ordered.



Thank you, sir.. Now, then, I believe you stated that you had a --

MR. DUPUY: I would like to make a motion that we advise the Schlieder Foundation that if it is interested in eliminating or retrieving or excluding a five-acre tract from the property offered to the Commission, that it will be extended the courtesy of having the opportunity of retrieving or excluding the five acres, if it wishes to do so.

THE CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, you have heard the motion. Do I have a second?

MR. WILLE: I will second it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any discussion? If there is no discussion, those in favor, say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

THE CHAIRMAN: Opposed, no.

(No response)

The motion is carried.

MR. HEBERT: Mr. Chairman, may I make a statement?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, sir.

MR. HEBERT: Gentlemen, thank you very



much, and also I want to say that some of the problems that we talked about here earlier today concerning legislation and so forth, concerning the Wild Life and Fisheries, I think this will be corrected at our next session. Of course, I have always been a help to the Wild Life and Fisheries and I didn't want to say this before because I didn't want to try to influence your vote, but I do appreciate the kind attention today, and thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hebert, I want to say this. You have been in the legislature a good long while; I know the name well. You lose some and you win some.

MR. HEBERT: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Yancey.

MR. YANCEY: The next item, Mr. Chairman, has to do with land in Avoyelles Parish, and Mr. Dupuy is going to explain this.

MR. DUPUY: Mr. Chairman and Member of the Commission, ladies and gentlemen, there is an area in Avoyelles Parish of prime wildlife habitat. It is pretty much of a primitive area and, believe



it or not, there are very few that have not been exploited, particularly in Avoyelles Parish, but this is one. An acreage of about 9,700 acres or maybe close to 10,000 acres in Township 1, North, Range 6 East, known as the Comme du Terre swamp area, including a beautiful lake known as Sutton Lake. There are four landowners who own the whole of about 9,400 acres and the Avoyelles Parish School Board the sixteenth section and the Red River-Atchafalaya-Bayou Bouef Levee District owns 240 acres more.

So, we are talking about the possibility of acquiring 9,400 acres and perhaps getting the use without money being spent to purchase an additional 880 acres, or approximately 10,300 acres. This acreage has been offered to the Commission for purchase. We have discussed this informally before, and I would like to ask that we ask for an appraisal of the property.

THE CHAIRMAN: Marc, do you recommend that we --

MR. DUPUY: I so move.

MR. LAPEYRE: Second.



THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved by Mr. Dupuy, seconded by Mr. Lapeyre that we move on this property. I want to discuss this just a little bit. That is the lake that you and I fished so hard and it is so beautiful, back when we were youngsters, and I want to thank Marc with all my heart for getting this into a wildlife management area, if it is at all possible.

You have heard the motion and the second. Is there any other discussion? If not, those in favor, say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

THE CHAIRMAN: Opposed, no.

(No response)

Carried. So ordered. Thank you, Marc.

MR. WILLE: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say one thing, that the Commission should certainly recognize and thank Marc for the research and the extra work that he did in acquiring this land. I know it required a lot of his personal time and a lot of coordination, and I think the Commission certainly owes him a vote of thanks.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would entertain a motion



of that sort, Mr. Wille. I just got through thanking him personally. I don't know why I didn't think to ask the Commission, but you have an excellent idea, Mr. Wille.

MR. WILLE: I so move.

MR. THOMPSON: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved by Mr. Wille, seconded by Mr. Thompson, that we give a vote of thanks to Mr. Dupuy for the excellent work he has done on this property. Those in favor, say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

THE CHAIRMAN: Opposed, no.

(No response)

So ordered. Mr. Yancey.

MR. YANCEY: Mr. Chairman, the next item has to do with the regulations pertaining to the taking of migratory waterfowl, and other forms of migratory birds. We have received several letters from the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. In one they advise that they are considering cutting the shooting hours on the hunting of ducks and geese back from thirty minutes before sunrise to sunrise,



and they are asking our viewpoints on this. They are additionally considering cutting the framework for the taking of woodcock from February 28 back to January 31, and they are making no mention of having another late framework on the hunting of geese, as we have had for the past several years in Louisiana.

We would like to recommend that we forward to them a strong resolution, objecting to cutting the shooting hours on ducks back from half an hour before sunrise, as is now the case. We also recommend that the framework on woodcock not be reduced below February 15, and we would also like to recommend that they be advised that we feel the goose season framework should continue to extend through February 15 because of crop damage problems, and also late arrival of some geese that are staying later and in larger numbers up in the midwestern states.

MR. THOMPSON: I so move.

MR. WILLE: I will second.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the recommendation. It has been moved by Mr. Thompson, seconded by Mr. Wille. Those in favor, say aye.



IN UNISON: Aye.

THE CHAIRMAN: Opposed, no.

(No response)

So ordered.

(The full texts of the  
resolutions are here made  
a part of the record.)

WHEREAS, the U. S. Fish and  
Wildlife Service has under consideration  
recommendations to change shooting hour  
regulations on migratory waterfowl from  
thirty minutes before sunrise to sunrise,  
and

WHEREAS, if this restriction is  
put into effect it would greatly reduce  
the enjoyment associated with the sport  
of hunting migratory waterfowl in  
Louisiana by prohibiting the taking of  
ducks and geese within thirty minutes  
before sunrise during the period of  
peak activity and movement of these  
important game birds, and

WHEREAS, this would unnecessarily



create insurmountable enforcement problems which would result in resentment against the imposition of such arbitrary regulations, and

WHEREAS, present-day point system bag limits provide all the incentive necessary for hunters to wait until visible morning light conditions prevail before beginning to shoot,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Louisiana Wild Life and Fisheries Commission does hereby urge and request the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service to continue to allow shooting hours to begin thirty minutes before sunrise in the hunting of migratory waterfowl.

WHEREAS, the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service Migratory Bird Regulations Committee has recommended that the framework for the hunting of woodcock be cut back from February 28 to



January 31 for the 1975-76 season, and

WHEREAS, this would greatly restrict opportunities for the Louisiana Wild Life and Fisheries Commission to set the woodcock hunting season during the period that would provide the greatest hunter success since these game birds reach a period of peak abundance some years in early February,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Louisiana Wild Life and Fisheries Commission does hereby object to cutting the woodcock hunting season framework from February 28 to January 31 but would not oppose cutting the framework from February 28 to February 15.

MR. YANCEY: We might also point out that the Fish and Wildlife Service has circulated a draft environmental impact statement on the hunting of migratory waterfowl, as they agreed to do last year when there was a suit filed in New Jersey to stop the 1974-75 duck and goose hunting seasons. In talking to some of the people in Washington, it



is our impression that if the duck hunters don't get more active in advising the people in Washington that they want this sport continued, we are going to soon be without it. This anti-hunting element is getting stronger. It is growing more vociferous. It is going into court. The duck hunters are simply not responding with enough letters and what-have-you on their views in order to let the people in Washington know that we want this thing continued in no uncertain terms.

I say that particularly for the benefit of Mike Wilson. Perhaps he would consider pointing this out in one of his columns and get some of the other outdoor writers to do likewise. Everybody needs to read that environmental impact statement. It is only 390 pages long, which could be accomplished in a matter of a few hours' time, but everybody had better take a hard look at this situation or we are really going to be in serious trouble. We have one copy they sent to us. As far as I know, that's the only copy in this state at this time.

MR. WILLE: I wonder if the Commission would be in order in drawing up a resolution, since



this is a beautiful opportunity, with the Outdoor Writers Association having their annual convention in Lake Charles, if the Commission could present the Writers Association throughout the United States with a strong resolution of our views on this particular impact statement, and I think we would get some real good coverage with these guys from all over the United States.

MR. YANCEY: The present plan is to hold hearings, the Fish and Wildlife Service is going to hold hearings, asking for comments on this draft environmental impact statement. One hearing will be held on March 17 in Atlanta. The other hearings, one will be held in Denver and one somewhere else in the United States, but everybody is working on a short time frame.

MR. WILLE: You don't think we would be in order then in presenting a resolution about our views on this?

MR. YANCEY: What we will do in connection with this thing is draw up a Commission position statement on this environmental impact statement and submit it to them for the record.



MR. WILLE: I see. Do you think a copy of this should go to the Outdoor Writers?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, but that happens in June and that is going to be after a great many of the hearings have already been in progress. We need to work fast here. We are going to take the position paper, we will have someone in Atlanta?

MR. YANCEY: Well, we had two of the top people from the Fish and Wildlife Service in this building with us earlier this week, and they said that we could send in a statement. This is what they expect most of the people to do, but the hearings are being held to satisfy the law, but they want our views in writing and we can do this within, I believe, a twenty-day period after the hearings have been concluded. We plan to get our statement together in short order and get it on in and this would comply with what they want us to do.

THE CHAIRMAN: What you are saying is that you don't believe that actual personal attendance would do a great deal.

MR. YANCEY: Well, the public hearing, of course, is to provide the waterfowl hunters and the



anti-hunters or whoever they may be to get up and be heard at the hearing, and there will be a transcript made of what is said at the hearing. But this particular hearing is being held at the same time that the North American Wildlife Conference is going on in Pittsburgh and you have got a conflict there. A lot of the state people are going to be in Pittsburgh, so it does create a problem. That is the reason most of the people, most of the states, are going to prepare written statements.

THE CHAIRMAN: I concede to your better judgment. I consider you one of the best wildlife people.

MR. YANCEY: The Fish and Wildlife Service, some of the people, tell us that if these duck hunters as individuals would send in letters outlining their views on how this sport should be continued, that it is essential that it be continued, that this would be helpful and would help offset this stream of letters or whatever they get from these anti-hunting organizations.

MR. DUPUY: How about a resolution from the Louisiana Wildlife Federation?



MR. YANCEY: Yes, certainly that would be advisable.

MR. KOSTMAYER: I want you gentlemen to shift gears mentally and let me wear two hats. If this is an opportune time, I want to talk to you about this Central Flyway situation and our realignment from Mississippi to Central. Is this the appropriate time for discussion?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair recognizes you.

MR. KOSTMAYER: It is about time I think to nudge Washington again. Some of our Congressional delegation feel there has been a little bit of a lapse, a little bit less interest in this Central Flyway thing. I was just wondering if you gentlemen would be willing to restate your position in that matter, in that area, and your determination that Louisiana enter the Central Flyway. Jimmie, do you know what I am saying?

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kostmayer, I don't believe there is anyone on this Commission that has ever entertained anything except entering the Central Flyway. I think we are working just as hard as we can.



MR. KOSTMAYER: I am certain that you are but there are some people that might think otherwise, and if you think it would not cloud the water, we are going to be working with the Congressional delegation next week and a resolution might stiffen their backbone a little bit.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am willing to recommend that anything that anyone suggests that will help us move into the Central Flyway as quickly as possible or as completely as possible be taken.

MR. WILLE: We already have the resolution. We can just reaffirm the resolution.

THE CHAIRMAN: Reaffirm the resolution.

MR. KOSTMAYER: That is what we would like very much for you to do, gentlemen.

MR. WILLE: I am going to entertain a motion, Mr. Chairman, that we reaffirm our resolution on entrance into the Central Flyway, and that a copy be furnished.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard Mr. Wille's motion.

MR. THOMPSON: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: Seconded by Mr. Thompson.



Those in favor of reaffirming our position on the Central Flyway, say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

THE CHAIRMAN: Those opposed, no.

(No response)

The ayes have it. So ordered.

MR. YANCEY: Mike Cook was commenting that the Louisiana Outdoor Writers Association meets tomorrow afternoon in the Fontainebleau and would be in a position to take up resolutions at that time for adoption, so a resolution along this line should mainly be that the Fish and Wildlife Service is requested to take a hard and fast stand against those who seem to be determined to stop the sport of duck hunting throughout the United States, and this would be the basic meat in such a resolution. I think that is what they are looking for.

MR. WILLE: Dick, why don't we draw up a resolution and you get it to Mike and, Mike, would you mind presenting it for us?

MR. MICHAEL COOK: Not at all.

MR. WILLE: Why don't we draw up a resolu-



tion reaffirming our Commission stand on this thing and give it to Mike and have him present it to the Writers Association.

MR. HURLEY CAMPBELL: OWAA, Don, will never adopt anything directing their writers as to what to write. In other words, 99.99 percent of us are against the anti-gun, anti-hunting movement, and we do have writers -- I know of one, Bill Burton in Baltimore, is 100 percent for anti-gun and anti-hunting. We don't try to dictate to them and if such a resolution were brought to the floor in the business meeting, it would either be tabled or voted down.

But here is what I suggest, that our resolution and accompanying data, and also on the alligator, let's do the same thing, be placed in the press room, because over 90 percent of them will use it in our favor.

MR. WILLE: I didn't mean to present it formally, as such, Hurley. I meant send a copy of it and maybe a letter with it, from the Commission Members and the Director, asking that they give us every support they can. I realize that you are not



going to entertain our resolution and adopt it, I know that.

MR. CAMPBELL: No, we never adopt anything directing a writer how to write. He writes on his own.

MR. WILLE: I know that; I happen to be a writer, too.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's the way it is, but we can get it before them and 99 percent of them are going to help us.

MR. LAPEYRE: We can logically appeal for their support, though, can't we?

MR. CAMPBELL: Definitely, and we will get it. We got it in the first alligator season and we can get it here.

MR. WILLE: O. K., that's fine. Hurley, you get together with Dick and get that thing put together.

(The full text of the resolution is here made a part of the record.)

WHEREAS, certain anti-hunting organizations filed a suit against the



U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service to halt the hunting of migratory waterfowl during the fall and winter of 1974-75, and

WHEREAS, this case was settled out of court with the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service agreeing to prepare an environmental impact statement prior to the establishment of the 1975-76 hunting regulations on migratory waterfowl, and

WHEREAS, a draft environmental impact statement has been completed and circulated to the states and other interested parties for comment, and

WHEREAS, it is important that comments also be provided by all parties interested in maintaining migratory waterfowl hunting as an important sport in Louisiana,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Louisiana Wild Life and Fisheries Commission does hereby authorize the Director to provide the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service with comments and



recommendations on the material presented in the draft environmental impact statement, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission does hereby urge all of those persons in Louisiana interested in the future of migratory waterfowl hunting to also formulate and offer comments on the impact statement and furnish same to the Director of the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service in Washington; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Louisiana Wild Life and Fisheries Commission does hereby urge the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service to maintain a firm position against those who appear to be determined to stop the sport of waterfowling.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right, I recognize Mr. Thompson. I have nothing else on the agenda.

MR. THOMPSON: That's all?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. THOMPSON: I didn't see DeWeese



Kostmayer come back into the room until he came to the microphone. Many, many times DeWeese and I have crossed swords. We don't agree on one particular subject, but thinking back over the years, DeWeese Kostmayer, and since we are throwing out a few bouquets, I would like to throw out a bouquet, and I want to still fight with him, I not not trying to appease him any, but DeWeese Kostmayer to my knowledge has been a tremendous factor in helping this Commission in many facets, not only in the purchase of this land that he has brought to the Commission, which we so sorely need, but --

THE CHAIRMAN: Wait a minute, Jimmie. I like what you are saying and I want these fellows to listen to it, please. Go ahead.

MR. THOMPSON: I can't repeat all that, but he has been a tremendous help and I think Dick Yancey can probably verify this as much as probably anyone here. I appreciate him and, like I say, I am still going to fight with him but I appreciate what DeWeese Kostmayer has done for the state of Louisiana sportsmen and I would like to personally and hope that this Commission would join with me in



recognizing him for those efforts.

(Applause)

THE CHAIRMAN: We certainly do, and I want to ask for a little bit of consideration, too. I have many good friends. Jimmie Thompson is one side side and Ted O'Neil on the other in coon hunting, Kostmayer on one side and Jimmie Thompson on the other side on the turkey hunting. I have never killed a turkey and I don't know as I have ever killed a coon; I know I haven't hunted any coon. It puts the Chair in a very tight spot to try to side with both of them, and I do like them, and I thank Jimmie for what he has said here. Maybe it will make it a little easier to keep peace in the family. Thank you, Jimmie.

Mr. Kostmayer, I would recognize you for about thirty seconds, if you wanted to answer Jimmie.

MR. KOSTMAYER: No, no, thank you.

MR. THOMPSON: He will talk about shooting those doggone turkeys!

MR. KOSTMAYER: I just thought maybe Jimmie had another joke for us!



THE CHAIRMAN: No, he is not joking. He means it.

Is there anything else, gentlemen? The Chair declares this session adjourned.

. . . . Thereupon, at 12:20 o'clock p.m., Friday, March 7, 1975, the special Board meeting of the Louisiana Wild Life and Fisheries Commission was adjourned. . . .

Kathryn G. Chamberlin,  
Reporter.

