

At the beginning of this article, I divided our fishery personnel into three groups. In succeeding pages, I have discussed primarily the training required by the key men. Those of good education who fall short of finding a place in the first group will automatically gravitate to the second. What I have attempted to emphasize is the need for specialized training and the avoidance of taking a hodge-podge series of subjects in biology, technology, economics, navigation and snap courses which give credits toward graduation but may lead to the dismal swamp of failure after graduation. Perhaps that is a bit overdrawn, for any training in the fishery field promises to be better than no training at all. In fact, the science of agriculture has passed through various transition stages to its high state of perfection of to-day reflected in the names of many of the bureaus in the U. S. Department of Agriculture, viz., Bureaus of Agricultural Economics, Animal Industry, Dairy Industry, Plant Industry, Chemistry and Soils, Entomology, Home Economics, etc. Of the four fisheries fields referred to, there is the greatest need to-day for trained men in economics and administration, men who will demonstrate the importance of such training to the industry.

Any university desiring to give special attention to training men for the fisheries and already having strong departments of biology, economics, technology and administration should have a well-trained economist and administrator familiar with the fisheries and the opportunities which the fisheries field has to offer as a head of the fisheries group. During the four years of undergraduate work, students intending to specialize in fisheries, in whatever field, might be given a one-hour weekly lecture course by this man to bring them together as a unit and familiarize them with the fisheries field. Lecture courses would include domestic fisheries, world fisheries, importance of fisheries and fishery products, methods of preservation and utilization, costs of production (rudimentary), competitive situation, exports and imports and other basic training needed for a proper understanding of the fishery situation. Under this plan the fishery head could carry the principal burden of training and directing fisheries men into proper fields. Such a plan would not require an extensive fishery organization but would have the advantage of training men for all branches of the fisheries. There is no adequate plan of this character in existence in the United States to-day.

LEWIS RADCLIFFE,

Deputy Commissioner of Fisheries  
BUREAU OF FISHERIES

## SUPPORT OF THE ZOOLOGICAL RECORD

VOLUME 66 of the *Zoological Record* contains the announcement that "Volume 67, dealing with the literature of 1930, is in preparation and will be printed and published if a sufficient support is obtained." The *Zoological Record* is accepted in this country too much as a matter of course. Not enough thought is given to the great amount of work required to prepare it, the contribution of the Imperial Institute of Entomology, nor to the financial burden of publishing it largely borne by the Zoological Society of London.

The *Zoological Record* is a necessity wherever taxonomic work is done, but it has never received due support from American institutions, where now in the aggregate it must be put to more use than in any other country in the world. American institutions should realize that subscriptions (in our sense) do not support the *Record*; in fact they do not bring back a fourth of the outlay on each volume. The remainder of the cost must be made up by contributions, and the Zoological Society of London should not be expected to carry the whole load. For Volume 65 the contribution of that society exceeded five times those from all other sources combined.

The situation is manifestly unfair, as the work is an altruistic one serving the needs of systematists everywhere. There is no substitute for the *Zoological Record*, and if its publication were suspended, American institutions would find it necessary at once to produce such a publication themselves. This can be avoided by giving merited support to the present going publication. Every American museum and every American society or institution having workers doing systematic work should feel under obligation to contribute to the *Zoological Record*. Directors of museums and treasurers of societies should put an item for this purpose in their annual budgets so that it shall not be left to chance, or perhaps come up for consideration when no funds are available. Contributions should be sent to the Secretary, Zoological Society of London, Regent's Park, London, N. W. 8, England.

The report of the society for 1929 contains a statement on contributions to the *Record* and it is not one to make an American feel proud. A few individuals and societies have done nobly, but museums in general have simply shirked. There is an obligation for support upon those who use the *Zoological Record*, and it is to be hoped it will be taken much more seriously by American institutions in the future than it has been in the past.

W. L. MCATEE

WASHINGTON, D. C.