

Our Sister State of Virginia for the past ten years has been operating under substantially the identical system which I propose in Maryland and I am today in receipt of a communication from G. Walter Mapp, Commissioner of Fisheries in Virginia, who states that the separation of the two activities has proven both practical and successful. I am also advised by the head of the Upland Fisheries of Virginia, Mr. M. D. Hart, that gratifying results have followed from the establishment of his separate commission ten years ago and that those experienced and interested in Conservation in Virginia would strenuously oppose returning to the hybrid system we have in Maryland. I believe that with the Chesapeake Bay and certain of its tributaries being virtually waters common to both States that the separation of the two divisions in Maryland is a definite step in the right direction.

There are many other reasons why the two essentially different divisions should be separately administered. One is commercial while the other is a pastime of sporting endeavor. About 75% of the cost of administering the State agency devoted to the sea-food industry is paid by the taxpayers while the administration of the upland game and inland fisheries is supported entirely by license fees from hunters and anglers. It cannot be denied that for years many persons directly interested in one branch of these activities in Maryland have been distrustful of those interested in the other branch. Constant, and at times bitter, resistance and opposition by one group toward the other have thwarted forward-looking and progressive steps. As a result, Conservation has suffered in Maryland and our people have been the losers. It is interesting to note, also, that in every one of the proposals by the different groups seeking conservation legislation, it has been recognized that the two activities are separate and distinct problems and should be administered in separate divisions.

Much has been said about my proposal to appoint to the two commissions "practical" men. Indeed, from the newspaper comments one would assume that the real issue is whether the two commissions should be administered by a body of experts or a body of practical men. As a matter of fact, what I propose is the procurement of a personnel which would embody both the practical and the expert viewpoint. The fundamental things in dealing with the sea-food industry are at all times to know the condition of the Bay and its tributaries and to following the silting of the Bay, to have which knowledge requires the services of scientific or technical study and the practical knowledge gained from every day experience. To coordinate the viewpoints and activities of the sea-food commission, my program contemplates a research bureau formed around the Biological Laboratory at Solomon's. In the Supplemental Budget to be submitted by me to the Legislature, I propose to include an allowance of sufficient funds to bring about such a Bureau by procuring the services of a person experienced in the study and correction of soil erosion and such other technical stuff as may be needed and to enlarge the scope of the activities of the marine laboratory.

Realizing, also, that one of the most important problems confronting the sea-food industry is to find markets for its catch at a fair price, the program will include publicity and educational activities to stimulate distribution and marketing. The program calls for strict enforcement of the conservation laws. It is well-known that the State's need has not been so much for new regulatory laws as in the enforcement of the laws already on the statute books. With the weeding out of many of those who are now in the employ of the Conserva-