At each of the previous meetings of this association informal mention has been made of a plan for providing in each state what might be termed a state leader or state inspector of soil survey work. As nothing very definite has come from these suggestions, I have considered it worth while to bring this matter before the association in a formal manner, for the purpose of encouraging some definite action along this line.

Following the first suggestion of this matter, the plan was adopted in Missouri and we have found it very satisfactory. The only difficulty we have encountered has been that of financing the project, although thus far we have been able to do this. Wisconsin has had some such plan in operation for several years, and I think there are other states moving in this direction. To me the plan seems a wise one and I should like very much to see this association take some definite steps to bring about its general adoption.

In suggesting such a plan I do not, of course, mean to minimize the importance of the work of the federal inspectors. Federal inspection is absolutely essential in order that a unified system of classification and correlation may be carried on throughout the United States. However, the detail of mapping has increased enormously during recent years. I think the first soil survey map which I helped to make, about twenty years ago, recognized but six soil types. I have no doubt that if this county were remapped today, not less than twenty types would be distinguished. Some of the earliest Missouri maps recognized but four soil types, while in most of our recent counties the number of types identified runs from twenty to thirty-five. Obviously the difficulties of the federal inspector have greatly increased. Likewise the knowledge of our field men must be much greater than formerly. It is perfectly obvious that if maps are to be made accurately, with this great amount of detail, much closer inspection must be given the field men than formerly, and it seems to me that we must look to state, rather than to federal agencies, for this increased amount of supervision.

A second reason for the adoption of this plan is that of recognizing the local peculiarities which obtain in the various states. Such peculiarities are readily be recognized by a man who is continually working within the state, while they may be overlooked entirely by the federal inspector who makes only occasional visits to the areas. In practically every county, cases arise where the point of view of the federal inspector is quite different from that of the local man. This difference of opinion usually arises from the greater familiarity of the state man with the local peculiarities. I think it is essential that the most consistent soil mapping, that the point of view of the state man should be given due weight in the classification. Without a state leader this is usually impossible and the decision of the federal inspector is final. I believe that the state leader should be the party leader of the soil survey work, and I should like to see this association take some definite steps to bring about its general adoption.