

U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE  
INTERVIEW WITH FORREST CARPENTER

10/25/89

**Dennis Holland:** Today is October 25, 1989, and I'm Dennis Holland. Being interviewed is Mr. Forrest Carpenter, former Supervisor of Refuges, Region 3, Twin Cities area. What's your mailing address, Forrest?

**Forrest Carpenter:** 16096 Creekwood Road, Prior Lake, Minnesota 55372.

**DH:** Okay.

**FC:** I was born and reared in the State of Oregon. My father was one of the first employees of the U.S. Forest Service. He served as a ranger in Northeastern Oregon for the U.S. Forest Service for many, many years prior to his retirement.

I enrolled at Oregon State University during the depression years; but I found that it was so extremely difficult to have the financial support that I was only able to attend college for a little more than a year. I filed an application with the U. S. Civil Service Commission for a job and was appointed by the Corps of Engineers as a clerk-typist on the Fort Beck Dam project in Montana; and went to work there in June of 1936. While there, I made a number of inquiries with the U. S. Bureau of Biological

Survey attempting to find work with them. And in the spring of 1942, I was able to get a position on the Malheur National Wildlife Refuge near Burns, Oregon, in the CCC program, as an Administrative Officer.

I became interested in the Bureau of Biological Survey, primarily because of the association that my father had with Ira N. Gabrielson who was at that time a Predator Control Agent for the Bureau of Biological Survey in Oregon. At the time I went to Malheur in the Spring of 1937, the refuge was in the early stages of development. John Scharff was the refuge manager and he'd been there only about two months before I reported for duty. Prior to John's appointment, Stanley G. Jewitt was in charge of the refuge. Jewitt co-authored with Gabrielson a book on the birds of Oregon. The only other full-time refuge employee was a reservation ranger, George Benson. George had been there for many years form the time the refuge was established. This primary duty was to patrol the area for the game law violations. George had developed a expert knowledge of ornithology and I spent a lot of time with George. I've always credited him with getting me very much interested in wildlife.

At the time that I reported to Malheur there were three CCC camps on the refuge. All three camps were administered out of the refuge office. As I mentioned previously, I worked as an Administrative Assistant purchasing supplies and processing payments for CCC supplies.

DH: Just how much purchasing authority did you have back in those days?

FC: Pretty limited...pretty limited. As I recall, you couldn't buy anything in excess of \$500 without approval from the Washington office. At that time there was no regional office.

DH: You reported directly to...J. Clark Saylor?

FC: We reported directly to Washington, DC. And at that time, J. Clark Saylor was chief of the Refuge Division and A. C. Elmer was Assistant Chief. Elmer was the man who stayed in Washington and handled all of the administrative details involving refuges. Virtually all of the letters were signed by A. C. Elmer. Saylor spent most of his time traveling around the United States looking for refuge areas.

DH: So you were there; that was when, 1937--did you say?

FC: In the spring of 1937 I reported for duty. I left there for the Upper Mississippi Refuge in the spring of 1941.

DH: Now that land was withdrawn from public domain, was it? Or was it purchased? Do you recall that, Forrest?

**FC:** The original acreage was withdrawn from public domain, but Malheur became a major refuge with the purchase of the so-called P Ranch in the mid 40's.

**DH:** But this is when John Scharff appeared--was that probably the first that it was put into shall we say, active management?

**FC:** Yes, that's right. As I mentioned, Jewitt was there previous to that, but did very little in the way of management. The CCC program really stimulated the development of the Malheur Refuge.

**DH:** And that was putting in the water systems...

**FC:** The water systems, buildings, dikes, dams, and fences--a lot of fencing. The CCC's should be credited for making a very important contribution to that particular refuge as they did for other refuges. It was a wonderful program.

I served in the CCC program until the program was pretty much abandoned in about 1939. At that time I was promoted to the position of administrative assistant at the Malheur Refuge. I worked there with John Scharff until I transferred to the Upper Mississippi Refuge, headquartered in Winona, Minnesota. Here again, in an administrative capacity.

eeee

**DH:** How did you get this transfer? Did somebody ask you about it or did you try to go elsewhere, through--recognizing this was back

in the early part of your career? Or did Elmer or Clark Salyer, say, "Forrest--pack your bags!"

FC: I don't recall exactly. I don't recall that I entered into making a plea for transfer; I think that it came from above. I had established a good rapport with J. Clark Salyer, and I think that Clark was always interested in helping people who he thought had potential in developing their careers; and I think it was largely through Salyer's efforts that I moved to Upper Mississippi. As an interesting sidelight, shortly after I reported to Winona, J. Clark Salyer visited the refuge. Incidentally, Ray Steel was the superintendent in charge of the refuge at that time. Salyer invited me to come down to the hotel one evening saying he would like to talk to me. So, I went down to the hotel, rather curious as to what Salyer had in mind. We had a good conversation and he gave me a good pep talk about the wonderful opportunities in the Service. As I remembered, he said, "You get busy and get your potatoes planted", meaning that it was about time I was getting married!

I took him at his word and I got acquainted with Juanita Eugebretson, one of the public librarians in Winona. We were married on Pearl Harbor Day, December 7, 1941.

FC: Shortly, after that, I was asked to come into the regional office to serve as an assistant to the then Refuge Supervisor, Fran Gillett. With some trepidation, we moved into Minneapolis as I was

1-A in the draft, and didn't know how long I'd be working before I went into the military service. Fortunately, I wasn't called to active duty until March 1945. I served just a year and a day in the military. At the time of discharge I was assigned as Refuge Manager to the Des Lacs National Wildlife Refuge in North Dakota. That was in the Spring of 1946. I was manager of Des Lacs until October 1948, at which time. Fran Gillett urged me to come back to the Regional Office, as he needed help. So I transferred back into the Regional Office and served as an Assistant Refuge Supervisor until Gillett transferred to Region 4, I believe in about 1957. At that time, I was promoted to Regional Refuge Supervisor in the Minneapolis Regional Office in charge of the refuge program in eleven north central states. I served in this capacity, but with a reduced number of states after the reorganization, when they established Region 6, until I retired in June 1973.

**DH:** Speaking of reorganizations, are there any that strike you as being most eventful in terms of your perspective as refuge supervisor?

**FC:** Well, I think the most significant thing as far as I was personally concerned was when they decided to establish an additional region in the Fish and Wildlife Service and reduce the size of Region 3 considerably by taking away the states of North and South Dakota, Nebraska, Iowa, and Missouri. This was an action

that I found most disturbing. With the reduced region, I felt that the job responsibilities were greatly reduced.

**DH:** Some of the major programs in those particular states were the wetlands program that took place under your supervision and guidance. The initiation--did that come under you as well, Forrest?

**FC:** The initiation of the wetlands program? Yes. Very definitely. At the Waubay National Wildlife Refuge in South Dakota, we had a manager, Frederick T. Staunton. He served at Waubay from 1941 to 1950. During this time, Fred became very much concerned about the amount of agricultural drainage that was occurring in the prairie pothole region of the United States. He wrote up several articles and made a number of contacts with the officials in the Service expressing his dismay at the vast amount of wetland destruction that was occurring. The then Regional Director, Dan Janzen, took up the cudgel and through their combined efforts and the support of the rest of us the small wetland acquisition program came into being. This has been a highly successful program in acquiring and securing of easements on wetland areas in the waterfowl production regions of the United States, particularly the Dakotas and Minnesota.

**DH:** That was the direct result of Staunton's and Dan Janzen's efforts?

**FC:** They were able to convince the Congress and the Administration of the need to expend funds to bring about the preservation of as many of these areas that were being subject to drainage as they could.

**DH:** Do you happen to recall the first wetlands management district that was established, if that was what you called it in the beginning? And who kind of headed up that program for you, from Region? Was that your reality chief that got into that for us?

**FC:** Well, there were many of us that were involved in the program. Reality was very much involved; Refuges was very much involved. At one point, the program was placed under my direction and it was administered as part of the refuge program. But, as this wetland program expanded, it was deemed advisable to decentralize activities into the field and establish wetland districts. Most of the districts came into being about the same time.

**FC:** These offices had ascertainment biologists and reality people. They would locate these areas that were being threatened or, in the process of being drained and contacted the landowners and tried to work out a purchase acquisition or an easement; and this is the way the program developed. At one time I believe there were as many as half-a-dozen wetland management districts in the two Dakotas.

DH: And that was literally taken away from you about what time, when was that reorganization? In the early '70s, mid--'72, '73? Somewhere in there?

FC: Yes. The reorganization took place in 1972. This action removed most of the small wetlands program from this Region 3 and put it into the Denver region.

DH: From your perspective, did you see any improvement for the Service, or just--I can see where it would greatly reduce the size of this region, Region 3. Chopped off, what four states out of it?

FC: Five states.

DH: Five states.

FC: So we were reduced from eleven states to six.

DH: Almost cut you in half, in terms of...

FC: Subsequently, Iowa and Missouri were restored to this region, but that was after I retired.

DH: As a matter of fact, that didn't take place until after the area offices were abolished, if memory serves me right. Could you give a little insight into the period of time when you were

supervisor, and the way that you recruited people for project leader slots, and selected managers.

**FC:** I always felt that one of the primary responsibilities that I had in my position was to see that the refuge program recruited the best possible candidates that we could find. I spent a good bit of my career in reviewing applications, interviewing applicants, and selecting them for refuge positions. I believe that as many as 400 refuge managers were hired during the time that I had the responsibility for the program. I feel that the quality of the people that were hired was exceptional. Of course, we had to adhere to Civil Service requirements and go to the Civil Service registers to get our people; but there were ways of encouraging individuals to get their applications in and on the roster. We followed the practice at times of hiring individuals on a temporary basis to determine how they would react to the refuge program; and if we found that they were wanting, we didn't pursue them any further. That was one good way we found to select people that we felt would really make a good contribution to the program.

In interviewing prospective refuge managers, I always made it a practice to have the applicant to bring his wife along so that I could talk to her, explain to her what was involved in refuge work, and to determine whether she felt that she would be happy to live in an isolated environment. I had found from experience that very often a refuge manager's work deteriorated or he resigned and left the Service because of an unhappy wife.

DH: And unfortunately none of that can enter into selections or anything else under today's rules.

FC: That's right. we had a much freer hand at that time in making our selections for managers, biologists and other positions than we have now.

DH: What about training? The academies, the refuge manager academies that developed--these also took place during your time as supervisor; I know because my first visit to the State of Minnesota was to Arden Hill and you were honcho then. Could you get into some of that detail?

FC: I think the refuge manager training program was outstanding and was one of the best things that the Service has done in giving, particularly the new managers; a feel of what's involved in the refuge program. These training programs, as I recall, lasted a couple of weeks. The managers attending the academy had an opportunity to get to know each other and this has, I think, developed a very cooperative relationship on the part of managers. You can talk to people who went through the program, as you did, many years ago, and you probably still will recall many important things that occurred as a result of that.

DH: Some of the best friends that I made were John Wilbrecht, Dick Rodgers, Bob Yoder, to name a few, who went through it. And you

know, we're of that same class and here we are, all retired now! How was that put together? Whose initiative, if there was a particular initiative on that, Forrest? 'Cause I know it took place here in your region.

**FC:** Yes. We had an individual, Dr. William Green, who had the ability to take over and operate this program. It worked out very well. Bill was a good instructor; he established excellent rapport with the people that were in attendance and I think that they'll always be grateful to Bill for the contributions that he made.

**DH:** Absolutely. While it was a national program, it was as a result of the groundwork and the efforts that you made on it.

**FC:** Yes, to a large extent.

**DH:** That's wonderful. Changing the subject completely, let's delve into a little bit on the funding that some of the wonderful funds, you know, you had such a great excess of dollars to play with back in those days, didn't you? Had more money than you could possibly spend! Or do I lie?!

**FC:** You know, as a matter of interest and strange as it may seem, back in the early days of the program, politics didn't play a very important role. The story is always told that when Al Day was director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, he would habitually go

to Congress and make a pitch for funds to operate the Service. He was always very conservative. I remember that, Mike Kerwin, Representative from the State of Ohio, was always needling Director Day because he didn't ask for enough money, and insisted that he ask for more money. But the Service administrators were very, very conservative. I really believe that the program could have been better funded in the earlier days if they had taken a more aggressive attitude because they had a lot of sympathy in Congress for expanding the program.

DH: Is that same attitude being manifested today. Have you any thoughts along those lines?

FC: Well, it's a different ball game today--the Office of Management and Budget pretty much determines how much money you can have. You're stymied in being able to appeal to the Congress for increased funding because of the restrictions, the limitations that are placed on the amount of funding that you can get. So, unless the people on the appropriations committees make a determination that you need more money. You are bound by what O.M.B decides you should have.

DH: What do you consider some of the major differences between the way refuges are operated now and the way they were in the early years of your career?

FC: As I mentioned earlier, refuge managers were not refuge managers as such. They were law enforcement officers on so-called reservation rangers. The administration of the refuge program in those years was largely a matter of law enforcement to see that people didn't trespass or violate the game laws.

DH: Well, it was a keep-out policy.

FC: Largely a keep-out policy. They were sanctuaries. Now, of course, the Migratory Bird Conservation Act was amended to permit forty percent of the area to be open resident to waterfowl hunting and to be open to game hunting, one-hundred per cent.

Refuge management is largely a program of public relations. That is, the manager is called upon to present and justify his program to the public. Environmental Impact Statements have certainly changed the way you approach things. Any major change that is made in the management program has to be supported by an Environmental Impact Statement, or Environmental Assessment, which means that the public becomes involved and you have to meet and deal with the public and convince them that what you have in mind is the appropriate thing. The present management program, of course, is involved in lots of things that weren't there in the early days such as contaminants. Water availability was a problem even in the early days, particularly in the West, and it certainly continues to be a problem at the present time.

**DH:** Well, the public involvement can be a double-edged sword. A case that comes to mind right now is in the East with deer hunting on the Mason Neck Refuge. Here again, because it's a new thrust, new activity. The fact that we are grossly overpopulated with deer has no bearing on the emotional aspects of these people--seem to think the Bambi syndrome prevails over sound resource management. How do we deal with things of that nature, and did you have anything of a similar nature to deal with during your period of supervision?

**FC:** In almost every case where you opened a refuge to hunting for the first time, there were certain elements of the public that would make a big outcry. Not only from the standpoint of those who felt that hunting shouldn't be allowed at all, but also from the standpoint of people who felt that the area being opened wasn't adequate. So, it's a two-edged sword.

**DH:** In the future, we have to be more and more responsive to the public and more accountable to the public. And the tracking issues that are going to be faced and are being faced--economic uses, grazing--whole variety of issues here keep coming up.

**FC:** But there are advantages also in public involvement if you can get the public behind a program. You can go a long ways to seeing that that program is accomplished. Because the public has quite a clout, of course, in the political arena.

DH: Absolutely. During your tenure, I'm sure you established more than one refuge, did you encounter any major problems?

FC: Certainly did!

DH: Give us a little insight.

FC: At one time we had plans for establishing a rather major refuge in North Dakota in the Langdon, North Dakota area. We had made an ascertainment and established tentative boundaries and what not, and everything was all greased. We had the support of one of the leading men in the town for the acquisition program; in fact, he was a strong advocate for it. We held a public meeting in Langdon and we nearly got run out of town. The merchant who was so solidly behind the refuge proposal found out that there were so many of his customers who were opposed to it, that he backed out. In fact, he even left the meeting and refused to offer any further support. So we had to back down on that. Interestingly, I understand just recently, the Service has been involved and again pursuing an acquisition program up there and it seems to be going ahead.

Another interesting case we had was in Terre Haute, Indiana. We had, again, determined that the area offered outstanding possibilities for a national wildlife refuge. We thought that the local landowners in general were in favor of selling their land; and we held a public meeting in Terre Haute. It was absolutely

amazing--the hall was filled with about 500 people. We had pickets outside who were parading up and down. One man with his child with a sign on him saying we were taking thier homes away from us. They apprehended one individual with a gun at the hearing. We were peppered with a few eggs and ripe tomatoes. As a result of that, we concluded that maybe we would forego trying to establish a refuge in the Terre Haute area of Indiana.

DH: It's amazing how things can get so distorted, isn't it?

FC: Absolutely amazing. Somehow or another I guess maybe we didn't do our groundwork sufficiently well; but, the people were so adamantly opposed that we believed that it would be virtually impossible to proceed, at least at that time.

In establishing the DeSoto National Wildlife Refuge on the Missouri River in Iowa and Nebraska, we had a series of public meetings down there. There was quite a lot of antagonism, but one thing that we had, was support from the States of Ohio and Nebraska. That went a long way in convincing the people that we could offer them a good program by establishing a refuge there. And subsequently, we were able to establish the DeSoto Refuge. As it happens on many acquisition projects, we were forced to make some commitments--public use commitments--that really weren't the best for the refuge. For example, there the people insisted that they wanted to have water skiing and use power boats on the DeSoto. At the time, we thought that we could zone off a particular area

and let them water ski. We found subsequently that this commitment was most unwise, but, fortunately, we have been able to put a stop to that program.

In many of the acquisition projects, commitments were made with respect to life tenure and permanent easements. While these sorts of things are not desirable, that we had live with them.

DH: Time will usually take care of such things as life tenure. And it does. It works out.

FC: Sometimes it seems like those lives last a long time! The Chautagua Refuge in Illinois was established many years ago along with lifetime cabin leases. There are still some of those cabins in the area.

DH: But eventually, they will probably disappear.

FC: We've had some interesting characters in the Refuge program over the years. One notable individual was Wesley Parker at the Sully's Hill Game Preserve in North Dakota. Sully's Hill came to the Service through transfer from the National Park Service and with it came Wesley Parker. Wesley was a very, very conscientious individual and was always concerned about doing exactly what the "office" wanted. On one occasion, we asked Wesley to remove one of the surplus cow elk on the Refuge. So he dutifully went out to remove the elk; but, unfortunately, a bull elk, the one lone bull

elk on the Refuge, was standing behind the one that he was attempting to shoot. He killed two elk with one shot! He wrote a letter to the regional office reporting that he had made a terrible, terrible mistake; that he had unfortunately killed the refuge bull elk and was thereby tendering his resignation. We didn't accept his resignation because it was ruled to be strictly an accident. Later Wesley submitted another resignation. He had a little public use area there on the preserve where people could picnic and they had toilets and other facilities. Wesley, was out with his wife servicing the recreational area. For some reason, Mrs. Parker was driving the refuge pickup truck. Unfortunately, a roll of toilet paper in the front seat got under the accelerator; and the pickup crashed into a tree. Wesley wrote the regional office tendering his resignation and saying that he knew that Mrs. Parker shouldn't have been driving the pickup truck and it was unfortunate that the pickup was damaged.

J. Clark Salyer used to have a great deal of fun with Wesley. I recall one incident when he was in the office where Wesley kept everything under every lock and key. His file cabinets were always locked and he had a massive ring of keys that he carried, on his belt and Salyer would deliberately ask for some item of correspondence from his files; so Wesley would carefully unlock the files, the piece of correspondence that Salyer wanted and then he'd turn around and shut the file cabinet and lock it up. As soon as he got it locked again, why, Salyer would say he'd like to see another piece of correspondence! That went on for five or six

times before Wesley got the idea that he was being kidded! But he was a fine old gentleman; and we laugh at some of these things, but there never was a more conscientious individual in the Service than Wesley was.

One of the most traumatic experiences I had occurred on the Waubay Refuge in South Dakota. We had a refuge manager at Waubay who came to us from, I believe, Research, from one of the other regions. None of us knew him very well, but we felt that he had all the potentials to be an excellent refuge manager. He was very intelligent individual. I went out to the refuge on a routine inspection shortly after he arrived, and I found two or three things that I thought were improper, that ought to be taken care of. When I got back to the regional office, the regional director had had a call, protesting that I had been sent out to the refuge to "get him." The regional director tried to placate him and told him that we certainly didn't have any intentions of trying to "get him" as he said; but that didn't satisfy him. At the time there were just the manager and a clerk stationed at the refuge. The manager sent the clerk home, locked up the refuge, took the keys into the local postmaster and told him he wasn't to release them to anybody except the Administrative Officer from the regional office. The clerk called the office to report what had happened. Well, in the meantime, the manager had headed for Washington, DC, in an attempt to talk to the President about how he was being abused and to tell him that people were trying to "get him." The White House guards found him trying to crawl over the fence to get

into the White House. At the same time he had written a very strong letter to the Secretary of the Interior condemning me and Fran Gillett, who was the regional supervisor at the time. It was one of the most disturbing letters I had ever been subject of. They sent him back out to the region with a suggestion that he be subject to a psychiatric examination. So we brought him into Minneapolis and took him over to the Veterans' Hospital to a psychiatrist. After three days of examination they said, "there's nothing wrong with this man at all!" So we returned him to duty of the refuge. Shortly, thereafter he was transferred to a position in another region.

DH: Share the wealth!

FC: Later we learned the poor fellow had had a brain tumor, and he passed away shortly thereafter.

DH: That's what you would call a rich, emotional experience....

FC: I never had encountered anybody who had a persecution complex like he had. It was a horrible experience!

DH: Did you ever have to mediate between, say, refuge families on a particular area, Forrest?

FC: No, not that I can recall. No.

DH: There's always a certain amount or small amount of friction that can develop on some of the isolated stations between families.

FC: I guess maybe we figured that that was something that the managers should resolve. Of course, if he's the one that's involved in it, that's something else.

DH: Yes, that's right. Sometimes. I was an assistant on one where there was friction between the employee's family and the refuge manager. We--Larry Givens, your counterpart at that time and I resolved that very simply by inviting the family to move off the refuge housing. It's amazing--that really solved the problem! There was no more problems from that point on.

FC: Housing on refuges has been something that's been subject to lot of argument over the years. Some insisted on living on the refuge, but they always objected to how much they had to pay in rent. Others insisted on moving off the refuge when we felt they should be living on the refuge. I guess this occurs in all elements of society, but when it comes to a matter of trying to redecorate or remodel a residence, you always run into problems with the people that were living.

DH: That's true.

FC: Objecting to fuel costs, that type of thing.

**DH:** Do you have any particular views on what you would consider to be a successful manager?

**FC:** Well, a successful manager wears a number of different hats. I think, first of all, he has to be a good public relations man. He should be able to work well, deal well with others including his associates. He should have an ethical standard--a high ethical standard. He should not expect that he should have privileges on a refuge that somebody else doesn't have, the general public doesn't have. In other words, a manager should not feel that he should be using a particular fishing area that is excluded to the public. He should have a good knowledge of ecology and understand what is necessary to provide optimum habitat for the species that he's trying to manage.

**DH:** Just the all-round superman, huh?

**FC:** All-round supermen or sperwomen - they're rather hard to find. But we found a few of them.

**DH:** Sure did. We've got some damn good ones out there! Thank God!

**FC:** That's right. I think that the successes that the refuge program has had over the years are due solely to these people. They're the ones who are on the firing line; they're the ones that

bring their refuge to the forefront and make their refuge an outstanding area for wildlife.

DH: On that we will conclude. Thank you, Forrest, and thank you very much for your thoughts.... And there's more.

FC: One of the reorganizations that I was never happy with was this program where they established area offices. I think that this was rather a low point in the refuge program. The area offices were definitely not needed. They created a separate layer of authority; and, consequently, there was a lack of coordination or cohesion between the refuges and the regional and Washington offices. I have always felt that there should be strong policy guidelines established from a central point for the guidance of all managers and it shouldn't be necessary to establish another layer of supervision if these people are provided adequate policy guidelines and are subject to periodic inspections from higher authority. I was real happy to see the area office concept eliminated.

DH: Let me go back through the organization structure, or the practical organizational structure from Clark Salyer's time. You mentioned that when you were at Malheur, you took your orders from Clark Salyer and A. C. Elmer. So it was central office with nothing in between. And then, as the system grew larger, we went central office-regional office-to field; and then later it became

central-regional-area-and field. So the layers kept getting thicker and thicker. And you favor a more direct approach, eliminating some of that layer.

FC: Right. I favor a strong central direction with adequate policy guidelines and let the men in the field operate.

DH: That's right. It works a lot better that way. Would you, if we take these theoretical lines (I say that for my own coverage at the moment), would you favor a legislation or some type of separation where we're dealing with a "refuge" structure as opposed to a "fish and wildlife" that encompasses so many other divergent responsibilities that have legislatively been added.

FC: Initially when we established the National Wildlife Refuge Association in 1975, we were considering strongly the idea of establishing a separate Bureau of Wildlife Refuges, removed entirely from the Fish and Wildlife Service. There was a strong opposition to this--and it's understandable--that maybe this wasn't the proper approach; but I feel and continue to feel that the Fish and Wildlife Service should be set up to provide a stronger national wildlife refuge system. Somebody at at least at the associate director level should be in charge of the national wildlife refuge program. I also object to the idea of calling the refuge system a division. The "refuge division" is the words that they like to use in Washington. It's not a division, it's the

National Wildlife Refuge System. When you compare it, of course as we like to do, with the National Park Service and the way they are administered, the Refuges System is fully as strong if not stronger nationally than the National Park System, but Refuges don't have the recognition in the organizational structure as do the National Parks.

**DH:** And we do have more lands than they do. Of course, I'm biased along those lines.

**FC:** Well, I am, too I guess, of course. But at the same time, I can see the inequities that are involved.