

Animal control will be practiced as one of several management tools to accomplish broader program objectives. Only a few weeks ago, Director Gottschalk, on behalf of Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, announced the basic elements of a new animal-control policy while addressing the National Wool Growers in Portland, Oregon.

Animal control will be conducted to assist in accomplishing four major program goals:

(1) Public health and safety, when it is necessary to control animal-borne diseases, such as plague and rabies and to prevent safety hazards, including aircraft-striking birds;

(2) Improving agricultural production, including the reduction of livestock losses and the protection of standing and stored crops;

(3) Resource management services, including necessary bird and rodent control to insure the success of range restoration, reforestation and watershed projects and wildlife management where control is essential to wildlife introductions, or undertakings to increase wildlife numbers; and

(4) Urban and industrial services, when control is necessary to protect buildings and residential areas, stored manufactured products, and underground conduits and similar installations.

These four goals can be pursued either directly, on an operational basis, when the proper methods can be applied only by skilled professionals, or through a program of technical assistance to land users and commercial operators to assist such people in conducting their own control programs.

In our search for improved techniques, continued field testing will, of course, be an important part of all four goals.

I want to stress one point of the new policy as it relates to the four program objectives -- we intend to place increasing reliance on the land and resource managing agencies; on public health officials; on industry and agriculture; and on their responsible officials and elected representatives in determining when and where there is a demonstrated need for control.

It is quite obvious that such is not the sole responsibility of this Bureau. Control is a management tool, to be applied when needed to accomplish a broader management objective and, if needed, it should be included in the plans prepared to accomplish that objective.

In addition to animal control, the Division of Wildlife Services has been assigned responsibilities in wildlife enhancement and pesticide surveillance and monitoring for effects on wildlife.

In enhancement work, emphasis will be given to migratory species, both game and non-game, with initial effort on Indian, Military, and Interior lands. This program will not duplicate or compete with existing programs. Instead, we propose to complement and work through existing programs. The needs are so great that the challenge is one of determining where to channel the effort to realize maximum results.

The pesticide surveillance and monitoring program is being designed to prevent adverse effects of pesticide applications on wildlife and the total environment. Initial surveillance efforts will be on Interior and other Federal lands. The monitoring phase will contribute to the National Monitoring Program to determine residues at fixed locations. This began last December, when the first samples of duck wings were taken from collections being made in each flyway for other purposes.

So much for the new Division. Now, let me turn to two applications of policy that have resulted, as anticipated, in some real controversy, here in South Dakota.

Frankly, a compelling reason for accepting your invitation was to come to this "arena for policy testing" and discuss the issues quite openly.

The first problem arose in implementing a Department policy to protect the black-footed ferret while controlling the closely associated prairie dog, specifically on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation of this State. The Bureau had responsibility for carrying out the Department's decision.

The second was a recommendation by the Bureau, supported by the Department, for us to refrain from participating in an expanded fox-control program east of the Missouri River as a pheasant-management tool.

Let me say, at this point, that we didn't make many friends with either decision and we have been roundly, and I think unjustly, criticized for both decisions and their implementation. Nevertheless, I am proud of both. They demonstrated real conservation integrity, in situations that provided unique opportunities to test responsibility for applying stated interest and policy.

First, let us discuss the ferret-prairie dog program. Here we had a dual responsibility -- to control prairie dog as a range management measure and simultaneously protect the black-footed ferret, which is among the species in the threatened category.

This was a real "toughy" because these animals live in close association, often in the same hole, and with the prairie dog serving as one of the major food sources of the ferret. Obviously, to control one was to affect the other.

The solution was to conduct precontrol surveys to determine the presence or absence of ferrets, and to bypass the areas where there was evidence of ferret habitation.

Yes, as might be expected, we encountered some initial difficulty. We had to coordinate with other Divisions of our own Bureau and work in harmony with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Bureau of Land Management, the Forest Service, the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks, and others -- not to mention the Tribal Council on whose land we were working.

The result was that we surveyed about 13,000 acres and treated about 12,350 acres. We received the support of the agencies already mentioned; trained our personnel in surrounding States where ferrets occur; located a new colony of ferrets; and started a long-range research project, thus setting a pattern for the future -- protecting one animal while controlling another.

Now, let us look at the "fox-pheasant" controversy. The Bureau refrained from participating in supervising a fox-control project as a pheasant-management tool for two reasons: First, there was inadequate biological justification; and, second, to have diluted further our supervisory capabilities for this purpose would have been contrary to Congressional instruction.

In taking this position, we did not question either the wisdom or action of the South Dakota Game, Fish, and Parks Commission in authorizing the program, for this is its prerogative and responsibility. The Commission has many considerations to weigh in its deliberations. The Bureau decision was made against a different set of criteria by which we must be guided and again it was a demonstration of "conservation integrity" -- made in the face of strong opposition, and lacking public support.

These two decisions -- the ferret policy and the "fox-pheasant" decision demonstrate the determination of the Department of the Interior and the Bureau to refine our guidelines and criteria for animal control. They are landmarks in reorienting the program.

In winding up, let me paraphrase some thoughts of Dr. John W. Gardner from his book, "Excellence," and commend it to your reading. I think these apply equally to The Wildlife Society as well as my Bureau, and specifically to the Division of Wildlife Services for which I have staff responsibility.

The responsibility for leadership is not, as too often assumed, vested solely in State, regional, or central offices of my Bureau or any other agency. Rather, leadership is the responsibility of every man in the field -- on the line. These are the men who help shape and mold public opinion and create the climate which ultimately will exert a very strong influence on the course we take.

And, responsible leadership requires many ingredients -- not the least of which are training and education, competence, perspective, standards, and the striving for excellence.

We cannot achieve our goals unless people at many levels accept the need for high standards of performance. The fiber of our profession depends upon a yearning for good performance.

Quite obviously, individual performance depends on education and on the development of a strong, responsible individuality. We must stimulate a vigorous sense of individuality and a shared sense of purpose. This can be and is accomplished in a bureaucracy if there is a favorable climate. Says Dr. Gardner: "We cannot admire faceless, mindless servants of the State or The Cause or The Organization who were never mature individuals and who have sacrificed all individuality to the Corporate Good."

Let me inject at this point, for those who may feel that the individual in the field is not important or does not make a contribution -- you could not be more incorrect. More than anything else it is individual actions, good or bad, that cause reverberations to the highest level of government. We see it daily in Washington.

Wisely nourished and responsibly exercised, individuality makes the strongest contribution to our shared purpose and broad goals.

In our own work, we are at a crucial point in examining these goals and too often the day-to-day details and temporal crises cause us to lose sight of the long-range goals we seek. We must not fall into this trap.

We should not, however, overlook the importance of these daily problems. Unless each is solved wisely, there may be no long-range goal. But it is the long-range goal that is our challenge and if we fail to meet this, all of the wisely met stratagems of the moment will be useless.

As professionals, as individuals, as bureaucrats, as Society members, we must foster individual and collective excellence. We, in the Bureau, intend to do so. I hope it will continue to be a goal of the Society and I urge you to support the Society and to call on others to do likewise.

Again, I thank you for this opportunity to appear before you.

#