

**HISTORY**

**MARYLAND ASSOCIATION**

**OF**

**SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS, INC.**



MARCH 29, 1945  
to  
JANUARY 4, 1969

# HISTORY

## MARYLAND ASSOCIATION OF SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS, INC.

March 29, 1945

to

January 4, 1969

**DEDICATED  
TO THE MEMORY  
OF**

**WALTER E. BURALL**

First President  
of the  
Maryland Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors  
and

**EDWARD M. DAVIS**

State Conservationist  
United States Department of Agriculture  
Soil Conservation Service  
during the first fourteen  
years of the existence  
of the Association.

## FOREWORD

It is not the intent, nor would it be possible for this history to give a complete account of all of the worthwhile activities of the Maryland Association of Soil Conservation Districts, Inc. The best that can be done is to record some of the highlights of activities and events during the first twenty-four years of its existence. Since the Association accomplishments relate to its leaders, this history is presented in the form of resume's of the six administrations of its presidents.

Under their leadership, the Association has striven primarily to help District Supervisors carry out their duties and responsibilities more effectively. However, it has also helped to initiate and move forward new and needed conservation programs. It has encouraged conservation education in all forms, but especially with the youth of the State.

The Maryland Association of Soil Conservation Districts, Inc. has cooperated and exchanged ideas with other state associations and the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts as well as state and federal agencies and private conservation and civic organizations.

Throughout the years, the Association has had the complete encouragement, cooperation and assistance of the Maryland State Soil Conservation Committee and the State Board of Agriculture. Conversely, the Association has served as a bridge between the Districts and the State Committee for the free passage of ideas and enthusiasm for conservation throughout the state and for program improvement.

\* Fred L. Bull, Executive Secretary  
State Soil Conservation Committee  
1950 - 1964

\* *Also served the Association as: Secretary-Treasurer, 1950 - 1953; Secretary, 1954 and 1955; Recording Secretary, 1956 - 1959; Secretary-Treasurer, 1965.*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Dedication.....	3
Foreword.....	4
Administrations	
Walter E. Burall..... March 29, 1945 - August 4, 1949	6
William R. Powel..... August 4, 1949 - January 6, 1953	7
Harry H. Rieck..... January 6, 1953 - January 12, 1959	8
Charles H. Remsberg..... January 12, 1959 - January 3, 1961	9
T. Walter Denny..... January 3, 1961 - January 6, 1966	10
Lathrop E. Smith..... January 6, 1966 - January 4, 1969	11

### Acknowledgments:

The assistance of Edward R. Keil, State Conservationist, USDA, Soil Conservation Service and the University of Maryland Agricultural Information and Publications Department in the preparation of this publication is hereby gratefully acknowledged.

The Maryland Association of Soil Conservation Districts, Inc., is a non-profit educational organization composed of the twenty-four Soil Conservation Districts organized under the Maryland Soil Conservation Districts Law of 1937, as amended. Its headquarters are at H. J. Patterson Hall, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742.

**WALTER E. BURALL'S ADMINISTRATION**  
**March 29, 1945 - August 4, 1949**

District Supervisors from fifteen Maryland Soil Conservation Districts met at College Park on March 29, 1945, to organize a "State Association of District Supervisors."

The meeting was called to order by Walter E. Burall, President pro tem. Other District Supervisors present were:

W. L. Frazee .....Allegany District  
 J. M. Hoshall .....Baltimore Co. District  
 Harry H. Rieck .....Caroline District  
 Cecil K. Holter.....Catoctin District  
 Clarence W. Brown .....Cecil District  
 Earle R. Keene .....Dorchester District  
 Foster Yost .....Garrett District  
 D. G. Harry, Jr. ....Harford District  
 Wm. R. Powel .....Howard District  
 James D. King .....Montgomery District  
 G. K. Ousler .....Prince George's District  
 J. Grant Yates .....Queen Anne's District  
 Dean E. Richardson .....Wicomico District  
 W. H. Holloway .....Worcester District

The following officers were elected:

President .....Walter E. Burall  
 Frederick District  
 1st Vice-President .....Harry H. Rieck  
 Caroline District  
 2nd Vice-President .....W. Lee Linkous  
 Harford District  
 Secretary-Treasurer .....John Cotton  
 Extension Conservationist

A "Preamble and Articles of Association" were adopted. (*See Appendix*) It was decided to affiliate with the Maryland Farm Bureau and to hold an annual meeting each year in January in Baltimore in conjunction with the annual meeting of the Farm Bureau. This practice was followed until about 1952, when it was decided to hold the annual meeting prior to the Farm Bureau meeting in order to have enough time to conduct the business of the Association.

The "Articles of Association" made no provision for dues. Each District was asked to "contribute \$5.00 to the Association to be used to cover incidental expenses."

Walter E. Burall served as President of the

Association until August 4, 1949. He had represented the Soil Conservation Districts of Maryland at National meetings including the organization meeting of the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts held in Chicago on July 25, 1946. Maryland was proud to be one of the 17 states represented at this meeting.

Three new Districts: Anne Arundel, Somerset, and Calvert, were organized during this administration.



**Walter E. Burall speaking at meeting in the Harford District in 1949. Others in picture, left to right: Dr. William B. Kemp, Member, State Soil Conservation Committee; Dr. Hugh H. Bennett, Chief U.S.D.A. Soil Conservation Service; and Dr. Thomas B. Symons, Chairman, State Soil Conservation Committee.**



**NACD Organization Meeting in Chicago, July 25, 1946, including Walter E. Burrall (second from right).**



**WILLIAM R. POWEL'S ADMINISTRATION**  
**August 4, 1949 - January 6, 1953**

On August 4, 1949, William R. Powel, Howard District, was elected President of the Association. Harry H. Rieck was re-elected 1st Vice-President, and Worley Umbarger, Harford District, was elected 2nd Vice-President. Edward M. Rider, Information Specialist, University of Maryland had already replaced John Cotton (resigned) as Secretary-Treasurer, and was requested by the Executive Committee to continue in that capacity.

New "Articles of Association" were also adopted at the August 4, 1949 meeting. These Articles were more complete than the original and included the following provisions.

1. Annual dues of \$2.00 per District Supervisor
2. More definite responsibilities of officers
3. Adequate representation of areas of the state on the Executive Committee (officers).
4. Permanent committees:
  - a. Legislative
  - b. Education
  - c. Public Relations
  - d. Finance

Provisions were made for past District Supervisors to continue their membership in the Association.

August 3 and 4, 1950 were the dates of the first summer conference of the State Association and the State Soil Conservation Committee. The place was the Wicomico Hotel, Salisbury, Maryland. These summer conferences have been held every summer since 1950. Each year, a different part of the state served as a meeting site and the locale for a tour of problems and conservation practices.

During 1950, the Dow Chemical Company instituted a national speaking contest among "average to small farmers and ranchers of America." The subject assigned to the contestants was "What My Soil Conservation District Has Done For Me." The Maryland Association's entry, Donald McKnight of Street, Maryland, Harford District, was the national winner in 1950. Mr. McKnight delivered his prize-winning speech at the January 1951 annual meeting of the State Association and again at the annual convention of the

National Association of Soil Conservation Districts in Oklahoma City in February 1951. The Dow Chemical Company presented him with a check for \$500. He later served on the Board of Supervisors of the Harford District.

The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad also encouraged conservation activities by making cash awards to outstanding individuals and districts. John Halabert Baden, Prince George's District, won a \$50 award in 1950. The Washington County Soil Conservation District won a \$75 award in 1951.

Beginning with the summer conference of the Association held in Frederick, Maryland, August 9 and 10, 1951, committee activities and recommendations became very important.

Secretary of Agriculture Brannon's Memorandum 1278 outlining the Department of Agriculture's soil conservation responsibilities aroused the ire of Soil Conservation District Supervisors in Maryland and nationwide.

Action taken by the Association in adopting a resolution and in endorsing a letter written by Calvert W. Norfolk, Chairman, Calvert District, left no doubt as to how Maryland Soil Conservation District Supervisors felt about Memorandum 1278. These documents stressed the importance of "local level" determination and management of soil conservation districts.

During Mr. Powel's administration, arrangements were made for the State Association to have the part-time assistance of the Extension Soil Conservationist at the University of Maryland and the State Association achieved legislative action to place two district supervisors on the State Soil Conservation Committee. Prior to this, the State Committee had been composed of five professional people.

An invitation to the National Association to hold its 1955 annual convention in Baltimore was declined.

The State Association had the honor of entertaining Kent Leavitt, President of the National Association and Robert M. Salter, Chief of the USDA Soil Conservation Service, during Mr. Powel's presidency.

Mr. Powel served on the Board of Directors of the National Association.



**William R. Powel presiding at State Association annual meeting, January, 1951. Others in picture left to right: Mrs. Rose Mattingley, Secretary; and Donald McKnight (now Reverend Donald McKnight) national winner Dow Chemical Company Speaking Contest.**



Typical of Maryland attendance at NACD Annual Conventions was this group at the Cleveland Convention in 1952.

### HARRY H. RIECK'S ADMINISTRATION January 6, 1953 - January 12, 1959

Harry H. Rieck, Caroline District, was elected President of the Association at the January, 1953 annual meeting. Horace Brauning, Carroll District, and Raymond Armstrong, Anne Arundel District, were elected Vice-Presidents.

Mr. Rieck presided at his first Director's meeting on April 6, 1953.

Full participation of the Association in the annual Maryland Land Week observance was stressed during this administration. Maryland Land Week was designed to:

1. Encourage those who till the land to apply the needed conservation measures.
2. Impress all citizens of the state with their dependence upon the soil and acquaint them with the effects of erosion, improper drainage, and soil deficiencies upon their health and welfare.
3. Create a better understanding of the interdependence of soil, forests, water and wildlife and the need for their wise use and development for their aesthetic and economic values.

Early in Mr. Rieck's administration, attention was focused on the importance of the state's water resources and on water legislation. Droughts and increased use of water for irrigation heightened interest in water conservation matters. C. E. Busby, nationally recognized water rights expert, spoke at a meeting sponsored by the State Association. Other meetings were held to deal with this problem. A result was the appointment of a state water study commission.

Committee activity was emphasized during this administration. Committees on Legislation, Finance, Education, Public Relations, Program and District Operations were appointed early and functioned actively throughout the administration. The committee reports presented at the 1953 summer conference held at Easton, Maryland, reflected this activity. (*See Appendix*)

A half day's program at the Easton meeting devoted to the participation of women's organizations in conservation activities was an innovation.

Secretary of Agriculture Benson's Bluebook "Strengthening American Agriculture through Research and Education" came in for a great deal of discussion in 1953. Soil conservation and soil conservation districts were completely overlooked in this publication. Soil conservation district Supervisors in Maryland expressed their resentment in a letter to Benson with copies going to Maryland's representatives in Congress.

Other highlights and accomplishments during this period were:

1. Workshops and training sessions for District Supervisors were instituted.
2. Changes in election procedures for supervisors were brought about, including balloting by mail.
3. Participation in all national, state, and local contests and program intended to further conservation and conservation education was maintained at a high level.
4. District annual meetings of cooperators were encouraged.
5. Articles of Association were kept up-to-date and changes made to meet current conditions.
6. The State Association was incorporated in 1956.
7. Districts were furnished with a helpful brochure and affiliate membership certificates and encouraged to give the public an opportunity to participate in the program by becoming affiliate members.
8. Invitations were extended to the National Association to hold its annual convention in Baltimore in 1956 and again in 1960 - The State Association entertained the National Association Directors at a dinner meeting in Baltimore to acquaint them with Baltimore convention facilities.
9. Waters S. Davis, Jr., President of NACD, visited



Maryland twice during this period. Nolen J. Fuqua, Mr. Davis' successor visited the State once.

10. The issuance of a monthly newsletter was instituted in 1954.

The Talbot District was organized in 1958

resulting in complete coverage of the State by Soil Conservation Districts.

In addition to leading the State Association for six years, Harry H. Rieck served on the NACD Board of Directors for four years, and as Chairman of the NACD Research Committee for six years.



Harry H. Rieck presides at MASCD Annual Meeting.



Harry Rieck, MASCD President, along with District Supervisors from seven Eastern Shore Districts greet Waters S. Davis, Jr., President, NACD, at the Salisbury airport, August 23, 1954.

### **CHARLES H. REMSBERG'S ADMINISTRATION** **January 12, 1959 - January 3, 1961**

T. Walter Denny, Queen Anne's District, and Raymond Armstrong, Anne Arundel District, served as Vice-Presidents in the Remsberg administration. Carl A. Heider and Lathrop E. Smith served as Secretary-Treasurer at different times during the Remsberg administration.

It was only natural that Conservation Education would be stressed during Charles Remsberg's administration, including participation in such programs as Soil Stewardship and Maryland Land Weeks. Youth activities had always played an important part in the education program of his home District, the Catoctin District.

A large part of the program of the 1960 Summer Conference was devoted to a discussion of conservation education in the schools of the State. Representatives of two county school systems appeared on the program and explained how they were integrating conservation education in the curriculum of their schools. A representative of the State Department of Education also participated.

Forestry and wildlife conservation were stressed during several tours held in different parts of the State.

Duties and responsibilities of District Supervisors received considerable attention. Their responsibility to plan their own meetings was emphasized. The Executive Committee of the State Association became active in planning state meetings.

Proper use of publicly-owned District equipment was also emphasized. The District Supervisors' responsibilities in this connection were reviewed.

Consideration was given to recommending that the state law be amended to change the name of Soil Conservation Districts to Soil and Water Conservation Districts. Legislation was enacted during this period making it possible to establish Public Watershed Associations in Maryland. This was important due to the increased interest in the small watershed (PL 566) program.



**Charles H. Remsburg**



**Youth Conservation Tour conducted in the Catoclin District. Note MASCD President Charles H. Remsburg and other Catoclin District Supervisors in foreground.**

### **T. WALTER DENNY'S ADMINISTRATION January 3, 1961 - January 6, 1966**

Serving with T. Walter Denny, Queen Anne's District, as Vice-Presidents during these five years were Raymond Armstrong, Anne Arundel District; Wilbur Dove, Howard District; Robert Stevens, St. Mary's District; and Gerald Holloway, Worcester District. Lathrop E. Smith was re-elected Secretary-Treasurer.

Mr. Denny's administration encouraged the holding of Executive Committee and Director's meetings at various places in the State to increase attendance and participation. This procedure also made it possible to plan statewide meetings well in advance and with local problems and interests in mind.

Suggestions for the revision of the District Supervisor's Handbook were requested and received. A new handbook was published.

The practice of holding the March Director's meeting in Baltimore followed by a luncheon and program on Soil Stewardship was continued. Church leaders and ministers of all denominations were invited to attend the luncheon meeting.

Recommendations for the appointment of District Supervisors to serve on the State Soil Conservation Committee received serious consideration.

The small watershed program and the problem of shore erosion received considerable emphasis during this five-year period in the history of the Association.

The State's shore erosion control program went into effect during this period, due largely to the efforts of President Denny.

Resolutions on Shore Erosion, Public Relations and Urban Research were passed by the Association and favorably considered at the Hershey, Pennsylvania area meeting in 1960.



**Walter Denny presents report on the accomplishments of Maryland's Soil Conservation Districts to Governor J. Millard Tawes.**

The Shore Erosion resolution read as follows: "We recommend the establishment, on a national level, of an NACD committee to collect, study, and evaluate information and data on shore erosion, and to advise the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts and its member Districts concerning policies, techniques, and efforts to be directed to this problem." This proposed NACD committee on Shore Erosion was established by action of the NACD Council at the 1963 convention in Denver, Colorado.

During this period the Association concerned itself with the relations of districts with cities and counties and encouraged legislation making it possible for districts to borrow money.

Districts were encouraged to revise their Programs of Work and to execute new Memoranda of Understanding with the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

District Supervisor Workshops or discussion meetings were held in four different locations in the State in 1963.

In order to further the small watershed program, Districts were encouraged to allocate some of their funds to watershed planning.

Area Vice-Presidents, Ray Shaffer and Howard Thornburg, as well as Directors Hans van Leer of Massachusetts and Cashar Evans of Delaware, visited Maryland several times during this administration. NACD President Marion Monk was guest speaker at the Association Annual Meeting in 1963.

The Maryland Association was host for the Northeastern Area meeting in August, 1964.

The position of Secretary of the State Soil Conservation Committee was changed to Executive Secretary during Mr. Denny's administration largely due to his efforts.



January, 1963, Annual Banquet honored past presidents. Left to right: Cashar Evans, NACD Director; Jesse M. Burall, representing his father Walter Burall, first President; Mrs. Charles Remsburg; T. Walter Denny; William R. Powel; Marion Monk, NACD President; Mrs. William R. Powel; Harry H. Rieck; Charles H. Remsburg.



The problem of shore erosion and its control received considerable attention during Mr. Denny's Administration.

### **LATHROP E. SMITH'S ADMINISTRATION** January 6, 1966 - January 4, 1969

Lathrop Smith, Montgomery District, had the help of Vice-Presidents Fred Lieske, Cecil District, and Norman Fike, Talbot District. Oscar A. Schmidt, Jr. Queen Anne's District, served as Secretary-Treasurer during the entire administration of Lathrop Smith.

An eight point conservation program and recommendations to Soil Conservation Districts was published by the Association for 1966:

1. To complete all district program revisions to reflect changing needs.
2. To have all Districts sign a Memorandum of Understanding with the Department of Forests and Parks, the Department of Game and Inland Fish, and other appropriate agencies.
3. To have published and made available a brochure explaining Maryland Soil Conservation Districts and their program.
4. To present to the County Commissioners and County Councils the case for county support of local Soil Conservation Districts.

5. To establish a Youth Committee in the State Association and develop a Youth Conservation Awards Program.
6. To bring about broader representation and participation by Districts in river basin planning.
7. To expand District operations to the end that Districts may plan a more effective role in conservation and resource development.
8. To publish a monthly newsletter in cooperation with the State Soil Conservation Committee to keep districts informed of programs affecting them.

The Farm Forestry Committee was especially active during this administration. It conducted a survey of services and facilities available for the development of a farm forestry program. A brochure on Farm Forestry was also prepared.

The Watershed Committee completed a Watershed Needs Inventory and developed a plan for state and local participation in the operational phase of the watershed program.

The District Outlook Committee developed a report on "The Future of Districts in Maryland." This was accomplished with the help and participation of the State Soil Conservation Committee.

Exploration of ways and means of making the Association eligible for a "tax exempt" status was continued with some progress made.

An amendment to the Soil Conservation Districts Law in 1966 enlarged the State Soil Conservation Committee to include the President of the Association and an additional District Supervisor as well as other agency people. The amended law provided for four District Supervisors on the State Committee.

Progress in developing a shore erosion control program continued.

Proposed Memoranda of Understanding between Districts and the Department of Water Resources and between Districts and local Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committees were prepared and their use encouraged.

Lathrop E. Smith, President of the Association, and T. Walter Denny, Past President, were named Soil Conservationist and Water Conservationist of the year, respectively, by the Maryland Wildlife Federation in 1967.



**Lathrop E. Smith presents a plaque to Mrs. Don Smith, President, Federal Garden Clubs of Maryland, in recognition of their contributions to the Conservation Education Program.**

**APPENDIX**

Page

1945 - Original Articles of Association ..... 14

1948 - Resolution Thanking Governor Lane and Dr. H. C. Byrd ..... 15

1951 - Resolutions

    1. Water Rights ..... 15

    2. Executive Secretary ..... 15

    3. Memorandum 1278 and Soil Conservation Districts ..... 16

    4. Anne Arundel and Calvert Districts action re Secretary of Agriculture’s Memorandum 1278 ..... 16 -17

    5. Resolution Thanking Governor and Legislative for Appropriations ..... 18

    Report District Operations Committee ..... 18

    Report District Education Committee ..... 19

1952 - Resolution re President-Elect Eisenhower’s statement ..... 19

1953 - Report of Committees:

    Legislative ..... 20

    Education ..... 20

    Public Relations ..... 21

    Finance ..... 21

    Program ..... 21

    District Operations ..... 22

1954 - Committee Reports ..... 22 - 23 - 24

    Special Water Resources Committee Report ..... 25

1955 - Resolution re farm quotas and ACP payments ..... 25

    Report of Ladies Committee ..... 26

1956 - Soil and Water Conservation Policy - adopted Sept. 14, 1956 ..... 27

    Dr. Singewald’s Proposal re Water Legislation ..... 28

    Joint Committee Counter Proposal (Wilson A. Heaps) ..... 29 - 30

1957 - MASCD Resolution supporting Counter Proposal ..... 31

    Resolution on Conservation Education ..... 31

1969 - Articles of Association ..... 31 - 32 - 33

## **ORIGINAL ARTICLES OF ASSOCIATION**

### **PREAMBLE**

Recognizing that fertile land is the basis of individual farm prosperity as well as community, County, State and Nation; and in order to protect and preserve the soil resources of this great State of Maryland, to promote the welfare of those who till the soil and those who are affected by its loss or deterioration and to cultivate a love for the soil as a sacred trust for unborn generations, we do hereby associate ourselves under the provisions of the following constitution.

### **ARTICLE I**

The name of this Association shall be the "Maryland Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors."

### **ARTICLE II**

The Chairman of each board of District Supervisors, by virtue of his position, is automatically a member of this Association.

### **ARTICLE III**

The annual meeting of the Association will be held at the time and place prescribed by the board of directors. Special meeting may be called by the President or when requested by the board of directors. Notice of each meeting, which is to be sent out by the Secretary-Treasurer, shall state the time, place, and business to be considered at the proposed meeting. The notice must be sent out at least ten days in advance of the meeting.

No business shall be transacted at any meeting except as stated in the notice thereof, unless a majority of the members of the Association are present and a motion to consider business other than that stated in the notice is approved by a two-thirds majority of the members present. Except as stated above, one-half of the membership of the Association shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business at any meeting of the Association. The concurrences by a majority vote of those present in any matter shall be necessary for its determination. Any District Supervisor from the same Soil Conservation District may represent the Chairman, and may express his opinion and vote at any of the meetings; provided this Chairman has so indicated his desire to have a substitution made in his absence.

### **ARTICLE IV**

A President, Vice-President, and a Second Vice-President shall be elected from the membership of the Association by the members of the Association at the annual meetings. In the years when the President is elected, representing any of the Eastern Shore Districts, it will be necessary that a Western Shore Supervisor fill the office of the Vice-President. The reverse shall apply when a Western Shore Supervisor is made President. This board shall appoint a Secretary-Treasurer. The officers shall take office at the close of the regular annual meeting and shall hold office for one year or until their successors have been duly elected and shall have qualified.

### **ARTICLE V**

The management of this Association between regular or called meetings shall be vested in an Executive Committee, composed of the serving President, Vice-President, and Second Vice-President.

### **ARTICLE VI**

The President of this organization shall be the executive head of the Association and shall preside at all its meetings and Executive Committee meetings. The Vice-President shall perform the duties of the President in his absence. The Secretary-Treasurer shall keep minutes of the meetings of the Association and of the Executive Committee and shall furnish members of the committee information pertaining to the activities of the Association. He shall receive and account for all money paid into the treasury and shall use such money as directed by the Executive Committee.

### **ARTICLE VII**

By-laws may be adopted and these Articles of Association may be amended by a two-thirds majority vote of all members present at the annual or special meetings of the Association, provided these proposed By-laws or Amendments are sent out with the written notices announcing the meeting.

**ANNUAL MEETING MARYLAND ASSOCIATION OF SOIL CONSERVATION  
DISTRICT SUPERVISORS  
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND  
JANUARY 18, 1948**

The following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

RESOLVED, that the members of the Maryland Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors express their deep appreciation to Governor William Preston Lane for his interest and earnest support in providing increased funds for the conduct of the Soil District Conservation Work throughout the State.

RESOLVED, that the Association hereby expresses its deep appreciation to President H.C. Byrd and the Board of Regents for recommending and securing increased appropriations for the Soil District Conservation Work throughout the State for the present biennium.

**RESOLUTION NO. 1  
ADOPTED BY THE  
MARYLAND ASSOCIATION OF SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT SUPERVISORS  
Frederick, Maryland  
August 10, 1951**

WHEREAS, there is an increasing demand upon the surface and ground waters of the State for irrigation of farm crops and other farm uses, and

WHEREAS, this development may create questions of both legal rights and land use problems for the landowners of the State, and

WHEREAS, the present laws of the State pertaining to water rights are not generally known and understood by farmers who may desire to make use of available water sources for irrigation and other purposes, therefore, be it resolved that

THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE of the Maryland Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors be authorized and directed to confer with the Department of Geology, Mines and Water Resources concerning existing laws and water rights pertaining to both surface and ground waters of the State, and be further authorized to request the legislative council, if necessary, to make a study of the laws of the State of Maryland and other states with the view of enacting legislation that may be desired and needed to clarify and guide the farmers in their planning and use of the surface and ground waters of the State of Maryland.

**RESOLUTION NO. 2  
ADOPTED BY THE  
MARYLAND ASSOCIATION OF SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT SUPERVISORS  
Frederick, Maryland  
August 10, 1951**

WHEREAS, the work of the Soil Conservation District Supervisors of Maryland has been greatly aided during recent years by the part-time services of the Extension Soil Conservationist, and

WHEREAS, the growth of the activities and responsibilities of the State Soil Conservation District Supervisors has greatly increased and is now demanding far more time than is now available from the Extension Soil Conservationist, therefore, be it resolved that

THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE be authorized and directed to confer with the State Soil Conservation Committee and other State authorities as to ways and means of obtaining necessary funds to employ a full-time Executive Secretary, responsible to the executive committee of the Maryland Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors.

**RESOLUTION NO. 3  
ADOPTED BY THE  
MARYLAND ASSOCIATION OF SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT SUPERVISORS  
Frederick, Maryland  
August 10, 1951**

WHEREAS, there has been considerable discussion and confusion in recent months as to the responsibilities and functions of the various agricultural agencies as outlined in the Secretary of Agriculture's Memorandum 1278, and

WHEREAS, it is the consensus of opinion of the Soil Conservation District Supervisors in the various Districts that the responsibility for the soil conservation program should be directly with the District Supervisors and be determined on a local level, and

WHEREAS, the Production and Marketing Administration is attempting to assume more administrative leadership over Federal and State agricultural agencies dealing with soil conservation and their personnel and policies than was originally contemplated by the Secretary's Memorandum 1278, and

WHEREAS, the District Supervisors view this development as contrary to the basic principles embodied under the State law placing the responsibility for soil conservation administration with the duly elected representatives of the farmers on a local level and contrary to the basic principles of the Soil Conservation Service, which was created for the purpose of rendering technical service to the Soil Conservation District Supervisors, and

WHEREAS, there is considerable confusion among farmers throughout the State as to the agencies responsible for advice and guidance with their soil conservation problems, as well as among Federal and State personnel of agricultural agencies,

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED

That the members of the Maryland Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors favor an amendment by the Secretary of Agriculture of Memorandum 1278, or the administration of that memorandum, to specifically provide that the Soil Conservation District Supervisors be recognized as responsible for the formulation and administration of soil conservation policies and practices on a local level, and that the Soil Conservation Service technical personnel be responsible only to the Soil Conservation District Supervisors on a local level within all the counties of the State having organized Soil Conservation Districts, and that if it be the policy of the Federal government to compensate farmers on the basis of conservation practices, that such compensation be paid in accordance with policies and practices firstly agreed upon by the Soil Conservation District Supervisors, who have always cooperated with all State and Federal agencies in the encouragement of wise land use practices, and that in so far as soil conservation activities in the various counties are concerned, the Soil Conservation Service technicians shall be answerable only to the Soil Conservation District Supervisors, subject to the administrative supervision of the United States Soil Conservation Service.

**RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE  
MARYLAND ASSOCIATION OF SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT SUPERVISORS  
Frederick, Maryland  
August 10, 1951**

BE IT RESOLVED by the Anne Arundel Soil Conservation District Supervisors that the letter dated June 9, 1951, addressed to Mr. Waters S. Davis, President of the National Association of District Supervisors, and signed by Calvert Norfolk, Chairman of the Calvert County District Supervisors (Maryland), a copy of which was sent to Mr. William R. Powel, Chairman of the Maryland Association of District Supervisors, and a copy of which is attached to this resolution, be read to the full assembly of the Soil Conservation District Supervisors of Maryland during an appropriate session of their Annual Conference to be held at Frederick, Maryland, August 9-10, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that following the reading of this communication that an opportunity be afforded the Conference for a full and open discussion of the subject, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Maryland Association request the National Association to cause this letter to be printed and distributed to all Soil Conservation Districts throughout the United States and to each member of the Congress of the United States.



## COPY OF LETTER

Prince Frederick, Md.  
June 9, 1951

Mr. Waters S. Davis, Jr., President  
National Association of Soil Conservation Districts  
League City, Texas

Dear Sir:

Since we attended our 5-County meeting in connection with Secretary Brannan's memorandum, No. 1278, a meeting of the Soil Conservation Service and a meeting back home with our own district, we have become very concerned, indeed, very worried, about the future of Soil Conservation.

We realize the fact that we are only one district from a very small county that has only been in operation for three years. What we say might not be heard very far. (But I beg of you as National President of Soil Conservation Districts in these United States, for the sake of Soil Conservation and the American Farmer, let's turn our thumbs down on the P.M.A. Deal) (the New Deal, if you please.)

We have been operating in this county (Calvert County) for three years as a district and we will invite anyone in to see the progress that has been made. The P.M.A. has been operating for many years. Their progress is never mentioned. Indeed, their concern is not beyond their jobs.

The Soil Conservation District in Calvert County has cost the taxpayers about \$2400.00, plus the cost of technical aid.

The P.M.A. pays out in cash alone, thousands of dollars yearly to farmers in the county who despise the idea of receiving a government check as such. They collect because they help to pay it and everybody else have their names in Santa's book, and why not the farmer. Many do not realize that this Government is buying their rights, and buying itself into power. We are doomed for complete controls under the P.M.A. Any time a government agency can tell a farmer how much he shall grow of any crop or crops, it can equally as well tell him how much he must grow.

The information the Soil Conservation District has and the know-how is very important to the future progress of the P.M.A. Are we going to be unwise enough to supply this, and sell our rights which are Democratic to a Socialist movement in our Government?

With the Soil Conservation personnel falling in line with the P.M.A. policies, which it will have to do under the Memorandum, it will mean that within several months it will have infected a great number of farm leaders with the ideas of the P.M.A. Consequently, we shall become spreaders of a movement when deep down in our hearts we know we are destroying the rights and responsibilities of the American Farmer.

With inflation constantly soaring, with our national debt growing by leaps and bounds, with taxes constantly becoming higher and higher, with government payrolls becoming larger and larger, may we ask one sensible question? Does it make sense that we, as farmers, should pay Federal employees high salaries, to distribute millions of dollars a year, which we have to borrow with interest, to farmers all over the country in a form of payment which looks like a check from Santa Claus? To the real farmers of this county, such payments are made on practices which they would do whether there was a P.M.A. check or not. Then, we as taxpayers have to support another group in the P.M.A. who go around and measure and check individual fields all over this country to see if such practices which they have been paid on don't produce too much for the farmer.

Worse yet, we have to support another group of Federal employees who see that we pay back in Federal taxes what they gave us as subsistence allowance.

Are we, as democratic Americans, and farm leaders to support such a program in the presence of inflation and a high National debt?

Soil Conservation Service all over this country has worked with the idea of conserving the topsoil of this nation so that it can be strong with an abundance of food for this country in time of peace and war for this year and years in the future, so that America can always be strong.

The soil saving program has grown by leaps and bounds through the wishes and interest of individual farmers all over this country. Under such a democratic system we can keep these United States strong in its greatest natural resource, its Topsoil. Let us not support a program which is headed toward a socialist move which will destroy the interest and the will of the American farmer to produce.

We, as farmers and Supervisors of Calvert County, feel greatly indebted to the services rendered through the technical services now paid by Federal funds, also the Extension Services in this State. We feel sure that without these men, Soil Conservation could not have made such progress. But, we are strongly opposed to such a program now in progress being sold to our farmers with borrowed taxpayers' money.

To you, as our National President of Soil Conservation Districts of these United States, we wish your deepest consideration on these issues in behalf of the future of Soil Conservation and the American Farmer.

Sincerely,

(signed) Calvert W. Norfolk  
Chairman  
The Soil Conservation District  
of Calvert County, Maryland

CWN: eck  
Copy: So. Md. Districts

**RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE  
MARYLAND ASSOCIATION OF SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT SUPERVISORS  
Frederick, Maryland  
August 10, 1951**

Be it resolved that the Maryland Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors wish to thank the Governor and Legislature for their support of requests for funds for Soil Conservation Districts in the past. The appropriations have made possible the carrying-out of the provisions of the Maryland Soil Conservation Districts act. The work being done by the Districts is of vital importance to the future health and welfare of the people of the State. Continuation of appropriations for Districts' work is necessary in order for an effective job to be done. Therefore, we urge the continued appropriation of funds for carrying forward the work of Soil Conservation Districts.

**REPORT OF THE  
DISTRICT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE  
MARYLAND ASSOCIATION OF SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT SUPERVISORS  
Frederick, Maryland  
August 10, 1951**

The Committee recommends:

- I. That Soil Conservation Districts adopt an educational program to obtain the interest of all people.
- II. That more emphasis be placed on local news and articles to be placed in the local newspapers, making sure that the name of the Soil Conservation District is included in the news item. Furthermore, we encourage local news publishers to get our name as Soil Conservation Districts accurate and correct.
- III. (a) That the governing body of each District should meet at least monthly.  
(b) That each District should hold annual meetings which every cooperator is urged to attend. Other interested persons should be invited.
- IV. That each District Supervisor should be familiar with his State Soil Conservation Districts law.
- V. We urge that the State Committee provide each District with copies of a revised Supervisor's Guide.
- VI. That care be maintained in selecting supervisors who are cooperators.
- VII. That supervisors should be required to accept their responsibilities.
- VIII. That each District have at least one man who can spend some time contacting prospects, and assist, advise, and encourage cooperators who need help.
- IX. That each District designate some place where state-owned equipment can be stored or located.
- X. That Districts send out short newsletters at least quarterly to all cooperators and other interested persons.
- XI. Encourage church and all civic organizations to recognize the work of the District.
- XII. That our educational program be extended to the public through moving pictures, radio, and television.

Thurman Warfield  
Chairman

**REPORT OF THE EDUCATION COMMITTEE  
MARYLAND ASSOCIATION OF SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT SUPERVISORS  
Frederick, Maryland  
August 10, 1951**

The Committee recommends that:

1. The State Association work for the adoption of an effective conservation education program in private and public schools throughout the State.

2. Every member of the State Association must know the conservation needs of his area and the purposes and aims of his Soil Conservation District as expressed in the District's Program and Work Plan. Through this knowledge, he can bring the program to the attention of other citizens and assist with the educational efforts of the State Association in the schools, the press, radio, and all other available methods of broad public education.

3. Most effective conservation education is carried out through tours and demonstrations, basing knowledge and understanding on the land. Soil Conservation Districts should serve as a clearing house for help with conservation education through all interested groups.

4. Each Soil Conservation District Board of Supervisors should urge school administrators in its area to include conservation education at each level of the local schools: primary, secondary, junior high, high schools, and Veterans Administration training programs.

5. Soil Conservation Districts are models of effort to maintain local self-government in conservation. Farm and ranch units comprise two-thirds of the private enterprise units in America. Business and industrial leadership should be better informed about Soil Conservation Districts, their purpose and their goals.

6. Boards of Supervisors of Soil Conservation Districts should enlist the full cooperation of all other agencies, groups and interests to promote the purposes and aims as shown in the Program and Work Plan of the District.

7. Boards of Supervisors should exert more leadership in informing such groups as the clergy, civic clubs, farm organizations, youth movements and others of their Soil Conservation Districts. In this the publication, "THE WHY, WHAT AND HOW OF SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS" can be a useful tool.

8. Each Soil Conservation District should adopt one Sabbath each year to be observed in its area and in its state as "Soil Stewardship Sabbath." Information and instructions about such a program and sermon work kits can be obtained from the National Association. A minister should be invited to open and close and to participate in the annual State Association meeting.

9. In all educational work carried out under the District program, the individual supervisors themselves should take an active part in doing the actual work on farms and in meetings. Each supervisor should make as many timely visits to farmers as possible, especially after hard rains when the need for soil conservation work is evident.

10. A committee of three, Mr. Worley Umbarger, Mr. William Nace, and Mr. W.S. Carroll, should investigate educational materials and textbooks and make recommendations to the schools and the Veterans Administration on such material.

Walter Burall  
Acting Chairman

**MARYLAND ASSOCIATION OF SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS  
College Park, Maryland  
1952**

BE IT RESOLVED that we, the Maryland Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors, endorse the declaration of President-elect Eisenhower at Omaha, Nebraska, on September 18, 1952, viz:

"That the Soil Conservation Service is a competent technical agency that makes its know-how available to farmers in locally-organized, farmer-run Soil Conservation Districts. It comes into the Districts to help farmers only at their invitation.

"I strongly favor farmer-managed Soil Conservation Districts, with the Soil Conservation Service and other public agencies giving such help as farmers request."

**REPORTS OF COMMITTEES  
SUMMER MEETING  
SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT SUPERVISORS — AUGUST 15, 1953  
MARYLAND ASSOCIATION OF SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS**

**LEGISLATIVE — CHARLES REMSBERG**

Our Committee had a lot of things to talk about, a lot of important things, more than the time we had to discuss them in. The Legislative Committee met together with the members of the Water Resources Committee which was recently appointed including representatives of the Grange and Farm Bureau. One of the things that we know is of primary importance, in the future we can foresee a lot of need for it; with the present trend toward irrigation is that we will need some very specific basic laws in the state to help protect our surface water so that all of us will have some use of it. A motion was made to appoint a joint committee to develop a program which would tend toward the proper legislation with regard to the use of water. It was seconded and passed. It was proposed that we follow somewhat the same plan that South Carolina is starting out with which is one of the few states on the Eastern Seaboard to have any law or policies which will in a way protect the people in the interest of water. The policy that South Carolina has adopted is something like this: They have established a state policy of seeing that water and its benefits are available to all. We have to start at the very beginning, we can't make any specific laws, but we have to start in a general way and work this out.

It was mentioned that the present appropriations for the Districts in the state for the work in our state now is about \$80,000 or a little more than \$80,000 and the question was asked as to whether we needed any more or not. Nobody made any mention of needing any more, we're trying to work with what we have and most of this money has been used. Some of this money is returned each year, maybe five or eight thousand dollars because of the suggestions that it be

used for certain kinds of work wasn't entirely in line with the way that it should be used, but there is improvement on the part of the District Supervisors in making their requests as time goes on. We agreed to thank the legislature for the present appropriations and we will try to conduct our work accordingly.

Some mention was made that in one case particularly, of a pond that a certain community wanted to build as a fire protection feature because of a very bad fire in that little town recently. The pond would be too near the road according to law and it was suggested that that particular board of supervisors have the technicians draw up a temporary plan for this pond and request to the Department of Geology, Mines, and Water Resources, and maybe in this special case as a fire protection factor in the community, it would be granted providing it was not a large pond.

It was agreed that the local board of supervisors petition the State Committee to appoint one person to complete the unexpired term of a supervisor, who because of resignation, death or other causes, would have to leave before his term of office was over. It was also agreed to recommend the change of election regulations so that we may have election by mail ballot instead of going to the polls in person. It was recommended also to have a representative of the Department of Geology, Mines, and Water Resources on our State Committee.

And then we'd like to stretch our necks out on the last one to pass a motion to recommend that the Beltsville Research Center go on a full conservation program.

Motion that it be adopted, seconded and passed.

**EDUCATIONAL COMMITTEE — WORLEY UMBARGER**

The entire Committee on Education was present with all advisors. With the able assistance of Mr. Magruder, University of Maryland, Mr. Kincaid of Frederick, and Mr. St. Clair of Harford County. The Committee opened with the discussion of many ideas pertaining to getting cooperation and the general public better acquainted with operations of local Soil Conservation Districts. This Committee does not see the need of a proposed state-wide reference book. We do, however, feel that such information might be available on a county basis as a reference to education material.

Pertaining to Maryland Land Week, over-all area committees necessary for publicity and financing a program for respective counties participating should be left to the decision of the people in the county to be directed toward further interests of people and a suitable time of attendance. As has been reported, we feel that the use of tours has been overdone on county and state-wide basis. We don't get enough participation by farmers or the people that we are trying to contact. The people who are expected to be there are usually there, but 75% of them are those people.

We don't get enough participation on a county basis on the part of non-cooperators and those are the farmers that we want to make this program suit. So that is our aim and hope that we can work harder for that. If Maryland Land Week is to be educational let's see how much education is in the program.

We suggest that a study be made of the over-all conservation education conducted in our public schools. If we make a study of this, we want to study the areas not being covered and ascertain how the local supervisors or the State Committee can help in these areas. We know that there is an awful lot of educational work done in our public schools, but we just don't know how much and how much help that we need. Some of us feel that the program has not been pushed as much in the past year as it was in the past two or three years back and we feel like in order to know what to do to help, we must know what their program is at the present time. It is the duty of the local District to sell the program in the local area. Use materials available and do something about it. I move that these recommendations be adopted. Moved and seconded that motion be carried.

## **PUBLIC RELATIONS — ROBERT GIFFIN**

1. Recommend a summary of District annual reports be given wide publicity in local papers. 2. Recommend local Districts urge equipment dealers to educate their people in the operation of equipment and its place in conservation work. Hold local meetings to discuss these problems with the dealers. It sounds foolish but I think a lot of we amateurs don't always get the best out of our equipment. 3. Urge all District bodies to review and participate in speaker program contests, the B.&O. Railroad and the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company Awards. Fred Hazen of Montgomery informed our group of the Montgomery District Supervisors methods of awarding Conservation District signs to cooperators on work accomplished annually. I heard this

morning a gentleman from Pennsylvania said he'd only seen one. I assure you there are none in Anne Arundel County that I know of. 4. Recommend the Maryland Poultry reference book be supplied each chairman of District bodies for their consideration. In other words we would like to know exactly what this book issued by the Maryland Poultry reference book is so that we can take it up at the annual meeting and decide whether or not we would need a reference book for soil conservation. 5. Recommend Districts to avail themselves of the services of "The Committee For Conservation Now," 31 South Calvert St., Baltimore, in a promotion of conservation publicity. Motion for adoption was passed and carried.

## **FINANCE COMMITTEE — COL. LATHROP SMITH**

The Finance Committee found upon its agenda four items. 1. Soil Conservation District reference books. 2. The State and National Quotas. 3. The audit of local funds and 4. Annual budgets. Now in dealing with these in reverse, your committee recommends that Districts accomplish and return their budgets promptly. They find no area of disagreement with the methods that these budgets have been handled by the central state authority. In the matter of local funds we recommend that audits be accomplished. These audits should be accomplished by disinterested persons qualified to do so, not necessarily certified accountants. We think also that it should be borne in mind that this is a protection to the individual who is responsible for these funds.

With reference to the first two items, the Committee realized that these were part and parcel of the same subject. Considerable and spirited discussion was induced by the suggestion that a Soil Conservation Districts reference book

be published. It was felt, however, that under present conditions and recognizing the fact that in the State of Maryland we have counties who operate under totally different conditions, that it would probably be unwise at this time to attempt to publish such a book. There was some difference of opinion in the Committee. It is obvious that this suggestion has considerable merit, however, we did feel that more study was required and while this might answer the problem for some counties, it certainly would be unwise to go ahead on a project which some felt was doomed for failure in other areas. Moved that the report be adopted, seconded and passed.

Harry Rieck appointed a committee with Smith as Chairman, to study the question of soliciting funds from implement dealers. Mr. Bull would then notify the members so that they could meet and prepare the recommendations before next meeting.

## **PROGRAM COMMITTEE — M. B. FUSSELL**

The Program Committee is composed of Mr. Paul Widdowson, Chairman; Herbert Asplen; W. Mitchell Digges; Milton Malkus; Howard J. Stant, James D. King; M.R. Shawn; and Walter Denny. I believe there was one more in there, but I did not get his name. Mr. Mark Miller and myself served in an advisory capacity. We took up five different things. First, was Soil Conservation District reference books and the committee concurred very heartily and whole heartily with the finance committee on its recommendations. The motion was made, seconded and carried that the publication such as a publication of the Maryland Poultry Council will not serve any worthwhile purpose in carrying out the program committee's objectives. They felt that some other means of raising funds should be used. Second, if such a reference book is published, it should be published with the point of view of going to each cooperator in the District. That would be a big job because it means a lot of copies. And third, that if anything was to be done that each District should publish its own news publication, that it would be more practical and achieve much better results. They discussed it on a regional basis and they did say that on a regional basis it would be much better

to have a publication such as that, for instance, on the Eastern Shore you have drainage. In Southern Maryland tobacco is the problem, and there are entirely different problems there. In Western Maryland, the topography is quite different from what it is down here on the Eastern Shore.

The Soil Conservation District Supervisors annual meeting was discussed. First, we recommend the continuance of the one-day meeting, as last year, in advance of the Farm Bureau convention. Last year you had the meeting one day previous to the convention. Two, that a part of the day's meeting be devoted to committee meetings and working in groups similar to those groups that were working today.

The Committee recommends that the State Roads Department be invited to participate on the program at the annual meeting. In some places the State Roads have not given the cooperation that they've given to others and it is felt that if the State Roads Department could participate in the annual meeting that we would have much better results in the District.

The third thing taken up was Land Week. It was

recommended that Land Week be continued on a regional basis.

It was recommended that each board of supervisors follow the Suggested Program for Greater Service guide and use that part which is adopted to the local Districts.

It was recommended that each board of supervisors

hold an annual meeting of the District Cooperators and it was felt that this meeting might be a means of raising money to finance the state obligations to the National Association. Mr. Widdowson do you move the adoption? Moved and seconded that the report be adopted and motion was passed.

### **DISTRICT OPERATION — ROYDEN POWEL**

This Committee recommends that the watershed approach to conservation problems be brought before every District. This may be best done by setting up meetings of a small watershed by having a luncheon or dinner and inviting all farmers in the watershed to hold a panel discussion with everyone taking part. This method could also be used on large drainage outlets. Of course, there is a problem here which doesn't exist like it does on the Western Shore where erosion and siltation fills up the Potomac River and the Baltimore Harbor. But we do have a problem of our creeks and inlets stopping up which is due to soil erosion which we felt could be helped by having in our District these panel discussions, bringing the farmers and all together.

Second, we have our operating of the different Districts. I understand some Districts rent out equipment, some Districts have all their work done by contractors. So, we recommend that a report be made to the Maryland Association of Soil Conservation Districts by each local District on how they handle their equipment in their District. This should also include those Districts in which construction is handled by local contractors. It is hoped that from this information a workable plan for equipment usage will be developed by the Districts. We recommend that each District furnish the Maryland Association of Soil Conservation Districts with an annual report of how they do their work. Moved for adoption and passed.

## **REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ANNUAL MEETING MARYLAND ASSOCIATION OF SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS January 5, 1954**

### **PROGRAM COMMITTEE**

Robert A. Stevens, Chairman  
Oscar Schmidt  
Herbert Asplen  
James D. King

Advisors:  
John W. Barnard  
M.B. Fussell

(1) The publication of a conservation handbook in the state was discussed at our summer meeting and not deemed advisable; however, the committee feels that further study should be given to such a publication on an area or District basis.

(2) Maryland Land Week has highlighted soil conservation work in this state for the past several years. The committee recommends that Land Week be continued on an annual basis as in the past. If possible, the summer meeting of the State Association should be held in conjunction with Maryland Land Week.

(3) In view of the fact that the annual convention of the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts may be held in Baltimore in 1956, each Board of Supervisors should see to it that as much soil conservation work as possible be established along the main highways leading into Baltimore and Washington, prior to 1956.

(4) The committee at its last meeting recommended that the State Roads Commission be invited to participate in the annual meeting. We urge this recommendation be followed next year.

(5) It is recommended that each Board of Supervisors follow the suggested program for greater service and use that part which is adapted to the local Districts. It is recommended that a committee be appointed to study the need for, and possibilities of, small watershed work and suggest and encourage action which might be taken by the State Association. In view of the interest shown and proposed legislation, Maryland Districts should be in a position to take full advantage of watershed programs.

(6) In view of the fact that several Districts have had considerable success with annual meetings or tours of cooperators and prospective cooperators, we recommend that other boards consider this means of encouraging conservation within their Districts.

(7) We recommend the continuance of the day and a half meeting starting with a tour similar to this year, such as a tour of the University of Maryland or possibly a fertilizer plant followed by a meeting of the Board of Directors at night and the annual meeting the following day.

## PUBLIC RELATIONS COMMITTEE

David Wallace, Chairman  
Foster Yost  
Robert H. Baker  
S.O. Northam  
Raymond Armstrong  
J. Raymond Kemp

Advisors:  
F.M. Rogers  
Harry Collins  
Preston Isaacs  
Fred Hazen  
Lester Ahlswede

The report made by this committee at the summer meeting in 1953 was read and reviewed.

Mr. F.M. Rogers reported the publication of a brochure celebrating the tenth anniversary of the Caroline District. Cuts from this brochure were used in the local press for publicity purposes. This committee strongly urges that each District make an effort to locally publish their annual reports. It is suggested for the sake of public interest and local press cooperation to rewrite and summarize the reports suitable for local consumption. The committee further recommends that the services of Mr. Ahlswede and the Committee For Conservation Now be called on for the preparation of these news summaries and reports.

The committee also urges that wide publicity be given the factual setup of the relationship of the Districts and the Federal Soil Conservation Service - the feeling being that non-farmers as well as some farmers are not fully aware of the respective responsibilities of the local Soil Conservation Districts and the assisting Federal and State agencies. This effort must be a continuing effort to keep the reading public and farmers abreast of the many changes in procedure and policies.

The committee offers for consideration, the possibility of the State Soil Conservation Committee submitting a copy of each work unit conservationists' monthly report to the Committee For Conservation Now for

their review and possible use for conservation publicity as a method to associate, expedite, and channel local information to the Committee. The committee feels this method should be discussed and coordinated between the State Soil Conservation Committee and the Committee For Conservation Now.

The committee recommends the rejection of a District reference book based on the premise of the Maryland poultry reference book, and as an alternative recommends a simple, inexpensive, local reference book, sponsored by the State Soil Conservation Committee. The committee further suggests that Mr. Ahlswede be consulted in the formulation of the reference book.

The committee is pleased to report that the Garrett District has formulated plans to hold an equipment dealer-cooperator dinner to discuss local problems toward a better understanding of their mutual responsibilities. This is real evidence of action coming out of committee discussions. All Districts are urged to follow this beginning by the Garrett Board of Supervisors.

The committee recommends that an appropriate resolution of condolence be sent to Mr. Walter Burall, Sr., on the untimely death of his wife and to Mr. W.S. Carroll, on the accidental death of his son.

The committee also recommends a resolution extending congratulations and best wishes to Dr. T.B. Symons upon his appointment as President of the University of Maryland.

## FINANCE COMMITTEE

Horace Brauning, Chairman  
W.V. St. Clair, E. Earl Remsberg  
Harry Zentz, S.W. Caldwell

Advisors:  
Grover Zimmerman  
Hugh Hancock

The advisability of issuing a Soil Conservation District reference book was again discussed by the committee. A motion was made by Harry Zentz, seconded by Earl Remsberg, and carried that the committee recommend that such a book be printed on an area basis each District providing the necessary materials and the state office being responsible for its publication.

The committee discussed annual quotas and recommends that quotas remain as in previous years.

The committee recommends that each District have its accounts audited once each year, the audit being made by a qualified and disinterested person or firm.

The committee also recommends that Districts give more thought and attention to the preparation of their annual budgets in order that funds may be properly spent and that money allocated to the Districts in advance be wisely used throughout the year to eliminate unwise spending at the end of each year.

## LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

John W. Hall, Chairman  
Calvert W. Norfolk  
William R. Powel

Clay Webb, Jr.  
Marshall T. Augustine  
James A. Seaman

### Proposal

After a thorough discussion of farm ponds, the Committee decided that Mr. Powel should confer with Dr. Joseph T. Singewald, Jr., concerning desirable changes in farm pond laws.

### Suggestion

Privately stocked ponds be exempt from all provisions of the present state fish law.

## RECOMMENDATIONS OF DISTRICT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE

Thurman R. Warfield, Chairman  
Raymond Buchman

Fred Wilson  
Royden Powell

1. a. That at least one District Supervisor be responsible for District owned equipment.  
b. That Districts organize work so as to interest contractors who do heavy work.
2. a. That watershed work be speeded up by cooperation with small groups on a watershed basis.  
b. Cooperate with all other agencies to get the work done.
3. That District Supervisors establish priorities of work including equipment - technical assistance, etc. Work with PMA-ASC - County Committees in establishing priorities on requests from farmers.
4. That all Districts make annual reports not later than February 15th.
5. That Secretary send copy of minutes of District Supervisors meetings to State Committee.
6. That all Boards of District Supervisors meet at least once a month.
7. That all District Supervisors be cooperators in District.
8. That all Districts work closely with machinery dealers, State Road Commission and County Road Supervisors or County Commissioners, in order to do a better job in controlling soil erosion and conservation of natural resources, especially water.

## EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Worley N. Umbarger, Chairman  
Carl A. Heider  
Jay French  
Joseph Umbarger

Advisors:  
Charles P. Ellington, F.M. Rogers  
George Swartz, Dr. J.M. Gwin  
P.D. Brown, Rhea Kincaid

This committee had a very interesting meeting with all members participating in the discussion.

Principal points considered were Publicity, Cooperation of all Agencies, Youth Participation, and Land Week.

Publicity - not enough - use every available means - newspapers, radio. Some Supervisors should be responsible for coordination between Soil Conservation Service and Extension Service in the publicity field. Suggest regular column in weekly papers of a local educational nature and news items and radio to be principally from State Office. It was recognized by the committee that the Extension Service is the educational agency, but all should help in carrying on the work.

The committee also feels that complete and

unified cooperation between District Supervisors, Soil Conservation Service, A.S.C., Forestry, State Game and Inland Fish Commission, Extension Service and all other agencies makes a stronger and more effective educational program.

The youth of the state, including all school pupils, as well as Vo-Ag and 4-H Clubs, should be included in the educational plans.

The committee suggests more careful planning and study should be given to the conduct of Land Week, More non-cooperators should be reached. Plan programs to suit the needs of the people and do not make program too large. Have everyone possible participate in the program.

Use every possible means to interest tenants in Soil Conservation District program.

## RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Charles Remsberg, Chairman  
William Gardiner  
William Engerman

Advisors:  
Clarence Britt, William S. Ott  
Clarence Slater, Dr. John Lamb

The above named committee was appointed by President Rieck to look into the possibilities of developing some up-to-date information resulting from current research work, or that relating to work underway at this time, which might be interesting and helpful to supervisors, technicians, and farmers. The following topics were brought up during the hour of discussion with some information on results obtained so far by experimental workers in various states and in our Research Center at Beltsville.

I. Wide row corn planting: How it affects yields, soil and water conservation, problems arising with regard to when and where to apply fertilizers most effectively. Practicability of this method over the conventional method of growing corn. We also discussed the pros and cons of not plowing for corn or cultivation. Some special machines have been on trial which plant the corn in a virtual sod and weeds are controlled by spraying and fertilizers.

- II. Some field problems blocking research:
  1. Diversity of soil types.
  2. Learning how to handle "blocked water" resulting from terraces, chiseling, contour strips and plantings. Beltsville workers are now conducting work in the counties to find what soil types benefit from chiseling or subsoiling and which are harmed by the practice.
  3. To learn what soils can stand heavy cultivation and cropping and which should be retired to grassland farming.
  4. To get experimental data to show when "mole" drainage is better or more economical than tile drainage.
- III. It was unanimously agreed that constant research is necessary for an efficient agriculture and we would encourage work at Beltsville and state colleges with special emphasis on



"On-the-farm" demonstrations to give a more representative picture and stimulate local interest.

IV. How can we best handle soils which are punished through the use of heavy machinery these days?

V. We agreed that we must have a better knowledge of soil types in experimental work before more definite recommendations can safely be made on much of our experimental work.

VI. Fertilizer placement: Work is now being conducted as to where and when fertilizers should be most effectively applied with reference to definite crops with special reference to grasses. Nitrogen and potash can be more easily utilized without being concentrated in a band near the

seed because they move more freely through the soil than does phosphorus.

VII. We would probably do a better job by doing less moldboard plowing and substituting a type of tillage which results in more of the organic matter being mixed in the surface soil rather than turning it under to decay and retard capillary water from reaching the surface. The mulch would also lessen packing by rain, retard runoff and hold moisture better.

Research is of necessity - slow. We cannot afford to jump to hasty conclusions. There are so many factors influencing results. Even on the same farm the results will vary materially because of different soil types alone.

**MARYLAND ASSOCIATION OF SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS**  
**COLLEGE PARK, MARYLAND**  
**January 18, 1955**

The following resolution was adopted by the Maryland Association of Soil Conservation Districts at its annual convention held in Baltimore, Md., on January 11, 1955.

Fred L. Bull  
Secretary

WHEREAS, The law requiring compliance with quotas on certain agricultural crops prevents many farmers from realizing ACP benefits because their quotas are now below their on-the-farm requirements, and,

WHEREAS, We the Maryland Association of Soil Conservation Districts, assembled at our annual convention, January 11, 1955, voice our disapproval, and,

WHEREAS, Congressman Clifford Hope has introduced HR 1573,

WE HEREBY petition our representatives in Congress to change the provisions of the law by supporting HR 1573 or similar legislation.

**WATER RESOURCES COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**Western Maryland College**  
**August 6, 1954**

The meeting of the Water Resources Committee was brought to order at 4 P.M., by the Chairman, Mr. William R. Powel. There were thirty-five present.

The minutes of the meeting held in Baltimore, Md., on January 4, 1954 were read. Mr. Powel made remarks concerning the activities of the Committee since the last meeting. A meeting was held with Dr. Singewald and attended by Mr. Powel, Mr. Davis, and Mr. Wheeler. A discussion was held in reference to changing the farm pond law to permit the construction of larger ponds. It was brought out that soundness of engineering on larger ponds due to the hazards must be considered. The meeting ended with the summation of each pond being considered on its own merits. It was also brought out that if farm ponds could be constructed with more free board that the pond could be constructed without the cost becoming excessive.

The Chairman discussed the sources of water for irrigation, also the needs for governing the use of water from streams. It was brought out that the problems were different in the different sections of the state.

Mr. LeFever from the State Department of Geology and Mines was present and was introduced at this time. He

made remarks relative to that department's work. There are three phases of water dealt with in his work, namely

- (1) Surface water
- (2) Ground water
- (3) Quality of water

He brought out the fact that they have 85 gauging stations in the state where they check run off water from streams. These records are some 27 years old. Three typical stations were selected and six month periods taken from the above three when the water was most needed for irrigation. These studies were passed around for the group to study. It was brought out that in the Deer Creek drainage area, which is one of the three above selected for study, that at 90% of the time there were 150 gallons per minute per square mile. It was brought out that the run off in different drainage areas varies. One case of extremes was the Monocacy River at Bridgeport which had a flow as low as .3 of a cubic foot per second while Deer Creek was flowing at 27 cubic feet per second.

The question was asked how to convert 150 gallons flow per minute to inches to be used for irrigation. One cubic foot per second for 24 hours equals two acre feet of water, or

a flow of 450 gallons per minute equals enough water for irrigating 78 acres 16 hours per day for applications of one inch per week.

It was brought out that at present there seemed to be enough water available to irrigate about 5% of the area in the state.

A discussion was held relative to the amount of storage that could be obtained by retention reservoirs.

It was brought out that (1) wells are now controlled by the state; ponds have restriction laws such as limiting size, type of construction, etc.; also that water rights on streams that a permit from state is a permit but not a right.

It was also brought out that laws refer to normal flow of a stream and normal use such as for families and livestock but that excessive use such as irrigation were not considered.

Mr. Wilson Heaps was called on by the Chairman. He expressed the belief that we will continue to have rainfall and does not feel that a great majority of people will go into irrigation. He stated that he had talked with Mr. Busby in reference to this subject of water and had received the following points:

1. It is important to get understanding of problem before getting legislation.

2. Surface water has very few laws relating to it.
3. Suggest that we work out our own solution by:
  - (a) Preliminary preparation
  - (b) Organizing work
  - (c) Committees formed to obtain data
  - (d) Brief report to people
  - (e) State laws passed

It was suggested that committees be appointed to take care of the several parts of information that need to be procured in order that laws relating to water rights may be dealt with.

Mr. Rieck moved and Mr. Kaylor seconded a motion that the Chairman appoint as many committees as necessary to gather information relative to water rights.

Mr. Bohanan gave the committee two mimeographed documents entitled "Problems in modernizing Water Laws" by Wells A. Hutchins, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service, Production Economics Research Branch and "Legal Principles Relating to Irrigation in Eastern States", U.S.D.A. office of the Solicitor.

Mr. Davis discussed the Hope-Aiken Watershed bill.

There being no further business, the Committee adjourned at 6:15 P.M.

**REPORT FROM THE LADIES ATTENDING THE  
FALL MEETING OF THE MARYLAND ASSOCIATION OF SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS  
GARRET COUNTY, MARYLAND  
October 14, 15, 1955**

Eighteen ladies, attending the Fall Meeting, met informally on Saturday, October 15, in the William James Hotel, while the men held their various committee meetings. Each one enjoyed the opportunity to become better acquainted with the others, and to discuss what part, if any, they might play in this all important problem of conserving our soil and water, forest and wildlife.

The following report was made to the Education Committee, and through them to the whole group:

1. The ladies favor no new organization as such! (They belong to too many organizations already.) However, they are willing to assume some responsibilities as an auxiliary if it is felt they can be of some assistance.
2. It was felt they could work most effectively through groups or clubs to which they already belong to (1) promote better conservation practices, and (2) promote conservation education among urban as well as rural families.
3. Specific proposals or objectives were made as follows:
  - A. Whenever possible attend and participate in all meetings, tours, conferences, or exhibits within their county or District, and particularly these annual meetings!
  - B. Create interest in essay and public speaking contests on conservation.
  - C. Encourage clubs and organizations to provide scholarships for Conservation Workshops such as now is held at Western Maryland College.
  - D. Invite classes of school children to our farms and homes to see and discuss conservation practices.
  - E. Suggest in our Homemakers' Clubs that conservation be included in the annual program of work.
  - F. Request a series of classes on conservation during Rural Women's Short Course at the University of Maryland.
  - G. Help to sponsor one large State-wide meeting for women on Conservation once a year to which all women's groups are invited (such as the illustrated lecture given in 1954 by Mr. Robert Stubel on the Brandywine Valley Project, at the Pratt Library in Baltimore). Groups to invite: Maryland State Grange, Associated Women of Maryland Farm Bureau, Federated Garden Clubs, League of Women Voters, American Association of University Women, the various county and city Homemakers' Councils, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, 4-H, Scouts, and other youth groups, P.T.A.'s, Civic Clubs, Women's Service Clubs, and many others.

H. Read publications and distribute conservation literature as widely as possible.

4. No official name for the ladies' auxiliary was chosen, although "Farmers' Hired Girls," "Farmers' Technical Assistants," "Farmers' Bosses," and others were suggested.
5. It was requested that a copy of these notes be sent each lady present and if possible to those who were absent on Saturday morning but who had been on the tour previously.

Respectfully submitted,

Mrs. Fred L. Bull, Temporary Chairman  
Mrs. Worley Umbarger, Temporary Secretary

**SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION POLICY OF THE  
STATE SOIL CONSERVATION COMMITTEE AND  
THE MARYLAND ASSOCIATION OF SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS  
Adopted at Ocean City, Maryland, on September 14, 1956**

With a view of delineating the policy of the State Soil Conservation Committee in regard to all phases of soil and water conservation, the following is cited as the authority and the relationship of the Committee's activities in respect to a broader approach of water distribution and control in relation to soil and the agricultural interests of the State:

1. Under the Maryland Soil Conservation Districts Law passed by the Legislature in 1937, the control of erosion by water and the control of run off water are recognized as inseparable. The act clothes the State Committee with distinct authority to prosecute activities for the conservation of soil and soil resources of this State, and for the control and prevention of soil erosion, and thereby preserve natural resources, control floods, prevent impairment of dams and reservoirs, assist in maintaining the navigability of rivers and harbors, preserve wildlife, protect the tax base, protect public lands, and protect and promote the health, safety, and general welfare of the people of this State.

2. The responsibility was delegated to the State Soil Conservation Committee by the Governor, through the State Board of Agriculture, to cooperate with the Federal Government in assisting local organizations in planning and carrying out the provisions of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (PL-566) wherein the works of improvement shall include (a) flood prevention, (b) the conservation, development, utilization, and disposal of water in watersheds.

3. The state Committee recognizes the importance of water to all users - agricultural, municipal, industrial, and recreational and that any policy of water use and development should consider the relative needs of all.

4. The policy of the State Committee is, therefore, to cooperate with the Soil Conservation Districts and related agricultural agencies of the University of Maryland, Departments of Forests and Parks, Game and Inland Fish, Research and Education and other conservation agencies in

carrying out the intent of the State law by encouraging the establishment of land treatment measures which will increase the infiltration of water and decrease run off, thereby decreasing erosion, reducing floods, maintaining or increasing the ground storage of water, and maintaining stream flow.

5. The State Committee accepts the responsibility of cooperating with the Secretary of Agriculture and through the Soil Conservation Districts and local Forest Conservancy Districts - with local watershed and other responsible associations in taking advantage of the provisions of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (PL-566) as amended.

6. The policy of the State Committee in encouraging and assisting in the construction of ponds by farmers, communities, and others is for the purpose of conserving water for all purposes in rural and urban life. The committee advocates the enactment of amendments to existing legislation, which will facilitate the construction of ponds of sufficient size to meet irrigation and other needs.

7. The State Committee favors the maintenance of stream flow in our fresh water streams so that the flow will not be reduced to the point where it will result in harmful pollution or be detrimental to fish and wildlife.

8. The State Committee favors the cooperation of all interested groups - agricultural, industrial, municipal, and recreational - in developing a water policy of conservation, distribution, and use which best meets the needs of all users in the State.

The prosecution of the above policies in cooperation with other agencies will result in a reduction of damage by floods and erosion of soil and will make available more water of a better quality for use by farmers, city people, industrialists, and recreational interests.

COPY

DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY, MINES AND WATER RESOURCES  
102 Latrobe Hall, The Johns Hopkins University  
Baltimore 18, Maryland

June 26, 1956

Senator Louis L. Goldstein, Chairman  
Legislative Council  
City Hall  
Baltimore 2, Maryland

Dear Senator Goldstein:

In 1933, the Legislature declared it the policy of the State to control the appropriation or use of surface and underground waters in accordance with the best interests of the people of Maryland and enacted a law that placed Maryland far ahead of the other humid states in conservation, protection, and utilization of its water resources (Article 66C, Sections 666-681, Annotated Code of Maryland, 1951).

This law was eminently satisfactory and adequate, though it exempted from control the use of water for "domestic and farming purposes." The then practiced farming uses were only those granted in the case of surface waters under the doctrine of riparian rights and which are and can be included in an equivalent definition of domestic use, namely; "Domestic uses" means the use of water for household purposes, the watering of farm livestock, poultry, and domestic animals, and the irrigation of home gardens and lawns. This did not contemplate the uncontrolled use of water for irrigation of crops. The recent growing practice of supplemental irrigation has made the control under the 1933 law inadequate, and has also raised two other related problems for which the solutions are obvious and readily provided by appropriate legislation.

As Maryland in 1933 became the leader in far-sighted water legislation, so also Maryland ranks first among the humid states in the inventorying of its water resources. A comprehensive inventory of the water resources has been conducted by the Department of Geology, Mines and Water Resources since 1942, and has been completed in twenty-one of the twenty-three counties. This survey of the water resources and experience with the needs of water users has demonstrated that the solution of "the problem of the supply and utilization of water resources in the State of Maryland" (Joint Resolution No. 6, 1955) is merely the solution of the problems related to water supplies for supplemental irrigation.

These facts were set forth in a statement which I sent to all of the members of the Legislature in February, 1956, entitled "Concerning House Joint Resolution 6, 1955, Maryland's Water Resources Problem, Facing the Facts." The facts are restated and the specific solutions are explained in a paper I was invited to present at the Southern Regional Conference of the Council of State Governments in Charleston, South Carolina, April 27, 1956, entitled "A Conservation Program for Water Resources," a copy of which is enclosed.

That Maryland may again be as far-sighted as it was in 1933 and retain its leadership in constructive legislation, consideration by the Legislative Council of the enactment of legislation to the following ends is recommended:

1. Amendment of Section 668 of Article 66C by changing the words domestic and farming to read only domestic and adding a definition of domestic uses to read: "Domestic uses means the use of water for household purposes, the watering of farm livestock, poultry, and domestic animals, and the irrigation of home gardens and lawns."

2. Enactment of a modification of the doctrine of riparian rights to extend the rights to the use of surface waters to all the lands in a watershed and granting the right to store the flood flow of streams in reservoirs for use when stream flow is low and inadequate.

The pattern for such legislation is the excellent bill proposed by the South Carolina Water Policy Committee in 1955, entitled "A Bill to Conserve, Protect, Control and Regulate the Use, Development, Diversion and Appropriation of the Surface Waters of the State." Enclosed is a copy of this bill. The salient provisions of this bill are those which I have underlined in Section 2(c), Section 2(o), Section 4(a), and Section 4-A(1).

3. Enact a bill to provide financial assistance in the construction of reservoirs to store stream waters for irrigation purposes, patterned after Article 25, Sections 149-155, Annotated Code of Maryland 1951, which provides such financial assistance for the construction of shore erosion protection, the construction being financed by the county and the bonds amortized by annual assessments against the beneficiaries.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ Joseph T. Singewald, Jr.  
Director

JTSer/em

September 11, 1956

Senator Louis L. Goldstein, Chairman  
Legislative Council  
City Hall  
Baltimore 2, Maryland

Dear Senator Goldstein:

At the 1955 session of the General Assembly of Maryland, House Joint Resolution No. 6 was passed requesting the appointment of a special commission to study the water resources problem in Maryland. On August 19, 1955, Governor McKeldin appointed the commission requested in the Resolution. This Commission presented a preliminary report in January, 1956, a copy of which is attached.

The summary and recommendations of this preliminary report are found on page 50.

Special reference is made to the following statement in No. 5 in the summary and recommendations:

"5. When and if there is to be any changes in the present law, action should be taken only after a thorough study has been made . . .

The Maryland Farm Bureau, the Maryland State Grange, the Maryland Association of Soil Conservation Districts, and the State Soil Conservation Committee are of the opinion that the recommendations of Dr. Joseph T. Singewald, Jr., in his letter to you, dated June 26, 1956, fall short of being a complete solution to the present need for water rights legislation in Maryland.

After reading Dr. Singewald's proposals, we oppose them on the following grounds:

1. They are inadequate because they fail to take into account the relative importance which is to be placed on the two opposing doctrines of prior appropriation and riparian rights, fail to provide for any definition of terms, fail to make any provision for springs and streams which have their origin on a person's property or the exemption from control of small streams below a certain flow.

2. Farmers will be affected directly by virtual transfer of part of their present water rights to an agency of the State Government. There is no evidence that Dr. Singewald has held meetings in the farm communities to acquaint farmers with his proposed remedial legislation and in turn learn the effect it would have on their operations.

3. The proposal fails to provide for a policy making body consisting of representatives of the different users of water who will be most affected by the proposed legislation with the technical staff serving only in an advisory capacity.

The present water resources law (Article 66C, Sections 666-681 inclusive of the 1951 Code of Maryland) exempts farm use of water from control. Section 668 contains the following: ... nothing in this section shall be construed to apply to the use of water for domestic or farming purposes . . .

Section 669 in referring to the act provides "... nor shall it be construed so as to impair any riparian or other vested right . . ."

There has been no statutory control in Maryland over the rights of farmers to use water. One of Dr. Singewald's recommendations calls for the deletion of the word "farming" from the above section of the statute. This would bring all farm uses, other than for domestic purposes, under control. As far as farmers are concerned, this would be the same as though the act just came into being for the first time. Farmers are interested in their rights to the use of water and will want to know just what effect any controls will have on these rights.

The terms, "domestic use" and "farming or agricultural use" convey different meanings in the field of water law. "Domestic use" has been generally construed to mean use for household purposes, watering of livestock and chickens, and in some cases, for the irrigation of home gardens and lawns. "Farming or agricultural use" has been construed to include the use of water for irrigation of farm crops. Both the above terms are used in the present law and it is only logical to assume that the legislature intended that each convey its well accepted meaning.

Before amending the present water resources act, by deleting the word "farming", there are a number of questions which should be given careful study and thought. They are such questions as:

1. Is it desirable to adopt a strict prior appropriation doctrine to apply to all water uses other than for domestic purposes, or should the riparian doctrine be retained; and if so, to what extent?

2. What terms need to be defined in the law? The present law contains no definitions; yet it uses the terms "domestic use", "farming use", "riparian rights", "vested rights", and "abandment". A good definition should be provided for such terms as "domestic use", "vested right", "riparian land", "a watercourse", "diffused surface water", and any other such terms used in the proposed act.

3. Is it desirable to provide by statute for the maintenance of stream flow in our fresh water streams so that the flow will not be reduced to the point where it will result in harmful pollution or be detrimental to fish and wildlife?

4. What rights should a landowner have to the use of water from springs and streams which have their origin on his own property?

5. Should small streams below a certain minimum flow be exempt from control under the act?

6. Should the right to impound and use diffused surface water on one's property be clarified by statute?

7. What legislation is needed in order to encourage better conservation and use of the flood flow of streams?

8. What rights should nonriparian owners have to the use of water from streams?

9. Is it not desirable to have all the major water users - agricultural, industrial, municipal, and recreational - represented as members of the agency charged with the administration of a water resources act? This is the practice followed in a number of the other states. Sec. 10 of the proposed South Carolina bill referred to by Dr. Singewald so provides.

The adoption by statute of a prior appropriation doctrine will place limits on the riparian right to the use of water; therefore, it is only natural that those who will be most affected show a keen interest in any proposed legislation. Before farmers are willing to bring irrigation water under State-wide control, they have a perfectly legitimate right to insist upon a voice in how and to what extent that control should be exercised. Up to this time, there is no indication that Dr. Singewald has discussed his proposals with the farmers of Maryland to determine their acceptance of these proposals.

An article in the 1955 Yearbook of Agriculture by Mr. C.E. Busby contains the following statement beginning on page 675:

"Modernization of State water law takes place slowly at best. The drafting of legislation itself is only one of the many tasks involved. The major problem is obtaining understanding and acceptance of principles of law, which tend to limit what a landowner or group of owners may do with waters occurring upon or flowing over their properties." The corollary of this problem is determining the most practical manner in which authority to limit use of these waters is vested in and exercised by local or State agencies of Government.

"As the economy of water use becomes more complex, regulations must be resorted to so as to protect both private and public interests. This regulation amounts to a degree of transfer of power from individuals to agencies of Government. It is perfectly natural for property owners to resist such transfer until they are sure as to how a new or improved system is going to work. The key to success in bringing about this transfer ties in keeping control of broad operating policies in the hands of the people who give up some of their powers over water."

"In these circumstances a great deal of cooperative study, factual information, and planning is required to achieve understanding and acceptance of water problems and provisions of law required to solve them. Experience indicates that this can be accomplished best by the formation of State and local study committees (of farmers and others) that can concentrate on one major segment of legislation at a time. The task is so large in most states that it must be divided into segments - taking basic problems first, the solution of which affords a foundation for the whole superstructure of modern water codes. These basic problems vary from state to state, even though two or more states may have some common problems."

(Mr. Busby is a geologist, lawyer, and a conservationist. He is a member of the District of Columbia bar and a recognized authority in the field of water law. He has been advisor to twenty state commissions and committees, the council of State Governments and the Conservation Foundation in studying and developing proposals for State Water Legislation.)

It is recommended that the summary and recommendations contained in the preliminary report of the Special Commission to Study the Water Resources Problem in Maryland be given careful consideration. Any proposals for changes in present legislation should be explained and discussed with the people of the State. This can be accomplished by holding public meetings at different places throughout the State. In this way, the people would have an opportunity to learn the nature of the proposed legislation and its effect on them as citizens and taxpayers in the State.

In summary we recommend the following:

1. A careful consideration of the questions raised in this statement before legislation is drafted and the defining of terms used in the present and any proposed legislation.
2. The holding of public meetings in all counties of the State to explain any proposed legislation and to develop a better understanding of the effect it can have on farmers as individuals and get their reactions and comments.
3. The establishment by law of a Water Resources Commission as a policy making body. This group should be made up of representative users with the technical staff serving only in an advisory capacity. Reference is made to the proposed South Carolina bill referred to by Dr. Singewald which provides for such a commission made up of one municipal official, three from industry, and three from agriculture. These seven members along with four designated public officials who serve as non-voting ex officio members make up the commission.

From a committee consisting of representatives of the Maryland Farm Bureau, the Maryland State Grange, the Maryland Association of Soil Conservation Districts, and the Maryland State Soil Conservation Committee.

Presented by Wilson A. Heaps

**RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE  
MARYLAND ASSOCIATION OF SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS, INC.  
at its Annual Meeting in Baltimore, Maryland  
January 8, 1957**

Be it resolved that the Maryland Association of Soil Conservation Districts, Inc., endorse the counter proposal made by the farm groups to the Judiciary Committee of the Legislative Council on September 11, 1956, in answer to the amendments to the Maryland Water Resources Law proposed by Dr. Joseph T. Singewald, Jr., Director, Department of Geology, Mines and Water Resources, and that copies of this resolution and copies of the counter proposal of the farm groups be sent to the Governor of the State of Maryland, the Legislative Council, and to the members of the Legislature.

**RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY UNANIMOUS ACTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE MARYLAND ASSOCIATION OF SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS IN REGULAR SESSION AT OCEAN CITY, MARYLAND, ON SEPTEMBER 14, 1957.**

We, the Directors of the Maryland Association of Soil Conservation Districts assembled in regular session, recommend the inclusion of the broad field of conservation, with particular emphasis on the basic elements, soil and water, in the curriculum of teacher training institutions in Maryland with the view that conservation will ultimately be integrated at all levels of instruction in our public schools.

The Board further directed the President to forward a copy of this action to Dr. Thomas G. Pullen, Jr., State Superintendent of Schools and to the presidents of other teacher training institutions outside of the jurisdiction of the State Department of Education and further that this action be made a part of the permanent record of the Maryland Association of Soil Conservation Districts.

**ARTICLES OF ASSOCIATION OF THE  
MARYLAND ASSOCIATION OF SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS, INC.  
Including amendments adopted by the Association  
on January 4, 1969**

**ARTICLE I — Name**

The name of this organization shall be the Maryland Association of Soil Conservation Districts, Inc.

**ARTICLE II — Objectives**

The objectives of the Association shall be to exchange information relating to the administration and operation of Soil Conservation Districts and to effect cooperation between such Districts; to coordinate the programs of the Districts; to disseminate information throughout the State concerning the activities and programs of the Soil Conservation Districts; to cooperate with the State Soil Conservation Committee and other agencies assisting Soil Conservation Districts; to promote the interest and activities of the civic and other organizations in the conservation of soil, water, plant and wildlife resources through erosion control, land use changes and drainage plus watershed and recreational developments.

The Association will cooperate with the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts both at the area and national level in the furtherance of the conservation of natural resources.

Notwithstanding any other provision of these Articles, the Association will not carry on any activities not permitted to be carried on by a corporation exempt from Federal Income Tax under section 501 (c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code 1954 (or the corresponding provision of any future United States Internal Revenue Law).

### **ARTICLE III — Membership**

All members of Board of Supervisors of Soil Conservation Districts created under the provisions of the Maryland Soil Conservation Districts Law shall be eligible for membership in the Association. Annual dues shall be \$25 per District. When a member ceases to be a Supervisor of a Soil Conservation District, he may continue his membership in this Association by paying a membership fee of \$1 per year. This past-supervisor's membership will entitle the individual to all rights and privileges of the Association except that he will not be entitled to a vote or be eligible to serve as an officer of the Association.

All Presidents of the Association will automatically become lifetime members upon relinquishing their office as president. They will have voting privileges.

### **ARTICLE IV — Meetings**

The regular annual meeting of the Association shall be held at a time and place designated by the Board of Directors. The date and place of each annual meeting shall be set by the Board of Directors at the preceding annual meeting. Each member shall be given at least ten days advance notice of the time and place of the regular annual meeting. Special meetings may be called by the President and shall be called by him upon request of a majority of the members of the Board of Directors. Notice of each special meeting shall state the time, place, and purpose of the meeting and shall be mailed by the Secretary-Treasurer to each member of the Association at least ten days prior to such meeting. Except as stated above, one-third of the membership of the Association shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business at any meeting of the Association, and the concurrence of a majority of those present and voting in any matter shall be necessary for its determination.

### **ARTICLE V — Board of Directors**

The Board of Directors of the Maryland Association of Soil Conservation Districts, Inc., shall be composed of the Chairman of all Districts in the State, the officers of the State Association and all past presidents of the Association. The Board of Directors shall meet quarterly except in an emergency. District Chairmen who cannot attend meetings or otherwise serve as a director, may designate another member of the Board to represent them. Substitute directors will have full voting privileges. Notice of Directors' meetings shall be issued by either the President or Secretary-Treasurer at least two weeks in advance of the meeting, and the notice shall be accompanied by an agenda of the meeting.

### **ARTICLE VI — Election of Officers**

The Board of Directors shall, at the annual winter meeting, elect from the entire membership of the State Association, a President, 1st Vice-President, 2nd Vice-President, and a Secretary-Treasurer. In the year when a President is elected representing any of the Eastern Shore Districts, it will be required that a Western Shore Supervisor fill the office of 1st Vice-President. The reverse shall apply when a Western Shore Supervisor is elected President. The officers shall take office at the close of the regular annual winter meeting and shall hold office for one year, or until their successors have been duly elected and shall have qualified.

### **ARTICLE VII — Executive Committee**

The management of this Association between regular or called meetings and Directors' meetings shall be vested in an Executive Committee, composed of the President, the First Vice-President, the Second Vice-President, the Secretary-Treasurer, as well as all past Presidents of the State Association. The members of the Executive Committee shall take office at the close of the last session of the annual business meeting, and shall serve for one year, or until their successors have been duly elected and shall have qualified.

### **ARTICLE VIII — Duties of Officers**

The President of this organization shall be the executive head of the Association and shall preside at all its meetings and at meetings of the Executive Committee. The Vice-President shall perform the duties of the President in his absence or when he is unable to serve. The Secretary-Treasurer shall keep minutes of the meetings of the Association and information pertaining to the activities of the Association. The Secretary-Treasurer shall receive and account for all monies paid into the treasury, and shall use such monies as may be directed by the President and approved by the Board of Directors.

No part of the assets of the Association shall endure to the benefit of or be distributable to its members or other private persons except that the Association shall be authorized and empowered to pay reasonable compensation for services rendered.



### **ARTICLE IX — Committees**

This President shall appoint such committees as may be necessary for the conduct of the work of the Association.

### **ARTICLE X — Affiliations**

This Association may, with the approval of a majority of its members, become affiliated with other Associations of Soil Conservation Districts and other conservation organizations having a common objective.

### **ARTICLE XI — Bylaws and Amendments**

Bylaws may be adopted and these Articles of Association may be amended by a two-thirds majority vote of all members present at the annual or a special meeting of the Association providing there is a quorum present.

### **ARTICLE XII — Dissolution of the Association**

Action to dissolve the Association can be initiated by a vote of four-fifths of the directors present at any meeting of the Association. Ratification by four-fifths of the Districts will be required before the Association will be declared dissolved.

In the event of dissolution of this Association, the board of directors, after paying or making provision for the payment of all liabilities of the Association, shall dispose of the assets of the Association by distributing them equally to the Soil Conservation Districts which are organized under the Maryland Soil Conservation Districts Law to be used for educational purposes.

## **A TRIBUTE TO FRED L. BULL**

The history of this Association would be incomplete without some record of the person most responsible for the growth and success of the MASCD. These few words concerning the history of Fred Logan Bull are presented here. Fred was born in Virginia, October 5, 1902. He moved to Maryland in his tenth year to a farm in the Pocomoke City Area. Here he attended high school, graduating in 1921.

He attended the University of Maryland, majored in Agricultural Economics, and received his BS Degree in 1925. Fred was an active student, participating in many campus activities, as a class officer, student grange officer, student bible class officer, and was a member of Delta Psi Omega, later Alpha Tau Omega, and Alpha Zeta fraternities. "The Reveille" issue of 1925 says of Fred Bull, "Although Fred was an active member of almost every student organization, an officer of many, and never too busy to help others, he made a splendid scholastic record, being elected to Alpha Zeta in his junior year." There were many stories of Fred's college life -- earning money as a baby sitter; waiting on tables; taking care of an apiary, green houses and laboratories; working as a bank teller; etc.

After graduation, Fred became an assistant county agricultural agent, then transferred to the Soil Conservation Service, USDA, in 1936. He worked in Maryland and for a time in Delaware and Pennsylvania. In 1950, he became the Extension Soil Conservationist at the University of Maryland and soon after, the Executive Secretary of the Maryland State Soil Conservation Committee in which position he remained until his retirement in 1964.

Fred was the prime mover in many projects — Maryland Land Week, the Maryland Conservation Education Council, an idea which originated with him, and numerous others. However, it is probable that his greatest impact on conservation in Maryland in his over 20 years of service to his state was through his efforts and interests in behalf of this Association. The countless meetings with farmers, businessmen, officials, and other groups led to better understanding of the problems of the 24 Soil Conservation Districts and to programming efforts toward their solutions. His strong feeling of a need for conservation education and better understanding of our natural resource problems led to the organization of the Conservation Education Council, previously mentioned.

His influence was by no means limited to Maryland as he participated widely in area and national meetings. Many of the Soil Conservation District Supervisors, past and present, were the beneficiaries of his wise and enthusiastic counsel which so often and so fortunately led to a lifetime interest and devotion to conservation.

Thus, Fred Logan Bull has made his mark upon this Association as he has on many of us personally. We hereby make this record official in lasting friendship and appreciation. The Association is also indebted to Fred Bull for writing this history of the Maryland Association of Soil Conservation Districts.