

Zern, E. 1972. I am a hunter. Audubon 74(1): 17-19.  
A general article.

## TIME TO ATTACK

By

*Bobby Joe Smith*  
*Columbia, S. C.*

It is a pleasure for me to be with you today in this meeting of the Southeastern Game Commissioners. I would like to take a few minutes today to talk with you about something that concerns us all in a very significant way, the Anti-hunting Movement.

We can take the Anti-hunting Movement in three distinct ways. First, we can tell ourselves that it doesn't actually exist, that it is a myth or "new kick" that someone or some group has started just trying to get attention. Secondly, we can take a nonchalant attitude and say to ourselves, "If we leave it alone, perhaps it will go away." Or say we just can't afford to get involved. Thirdly, and this is the way I look at the problem, is to attack it head-on. This is what I would like to discuss with you today, some ways that we can attack this problem.

Let's look at some of the people involved in the Anti-hunting Movement. Be they pauper or potentate, they all have one thing in common, very few of them have ever cared anything about hunting in their lives. Some of them are busy just jumping on bandwagons to get some attention. Some of them have been caught for violations by different game department officials, tried and fined in court and are just bitter. We can go on and describe several different aspects of participants of the Anti-hunting Movement, but that would take all day. What I am concerned with and I hope your personal concern is — let's get in and fight it. If we believe in hunting to the extent that we are making careers and devoting our lives to its improvements, I believe it is worth fighting for.

You might ask yourself, "How can we combat the problem?" Gentlemen, I do not say let's sit back and be on the defense, I say let's take the ball, get on offense and play the game to win. Get in the ball game and put some points on the scoreboard for our team.

One of the first things I believe we have to do is educate our personnel. I know some of the game departments throughout the country have accepted this challenge. We in South Carolina have a first-rate educational program for the wildlife personnel and I believe we are in the position to defend the right of hunting as well as any state in the Union.

How many times have you been out working with your partner or some of the men in your department and you stop by a country store or restaurant for lunch or a soft drink and someone approaches you in a negative manner concerning your department or hunting in general. This has happened to all of us I am sure. It happens quite frequently in South Carolina. When this happens, how many times do you shrug it off, try to pass the matter off without causing a scene. We finish our drink, tell the fellow it was nice talking with him, get up and leave. This man feels he's really scored. He's made some points for his cause. Consequently, he has, because the fact that you did not correct him in a gentlemanly manner with all the courtesy you can muster, you in fact agreed with him. How many people does this person contact and say, "I talked with Bobby Joe Smith at this particular store, approached him with this matter and he agreed with me." He thereby has won a member for his movement. Would it not be a little better for you to approach him in the same manner and rather than say you are in a hurry and have to check Joe Blow's farm, or just make up something to get him off your back, to say very gentlemanlike that you want to hear everything he has to say about the matter and you want him to give you the courtesy of listening to your side of the story. Be up on the facts enough and knowledgeable enough to convince this person of what we are doing. If you convince this one fellow who

has a lot of mouth, think of how he will defend us when other people start talking about the Anti-hunting Movement. He'll be a mouthpiece and in the know. In taking this few minutes of your time, who knows how many more people it brings over to our side. Now I keep saying "our team" and "our side" and you might get the feeling I am treating this like it is a war. Gentlemen, I am talking about war - war on our profession, and we need to treat it as such.

Let's look at some of these people that are strong members of the Anti-hunting Movement. I have a friend, or I should say a passing acquaintance that I have played golf with several times, and he likes to talk about the cruelty of hunting every time he gets around me. A few months ago we were waiting on the tee to play the first hole and he started with his "mumbo jumbo." I looked at him, looked at his golf equipment. He had brand new alligator golf shoes and one of the finest leather bags money can buy. His wood covers are made from the hide of a mongoose. I then asked him where he got this equipment and he told me how it was all special ordered. I asked him if he thought that alligator volunteered his hide for those shoes, or that mongoose his pelt to make those wood covers or even the horse or cow that made his golf bag. Now he might have an argument on the horse or cow to make the bag but he could not come up with anything to cover the alligator or mongoose, because South Carolina has a law prohibiting the killing or molesting of alligators. After a little checking I found that the game officials in Africa are not very pleased with the killing of a mongoose. So you see, most of these people are like automobile dealers selling Fords and Chevrolets but drive a Cadillac. In other words if you don't use what you sell, don't offer it for sale.

In South Carolina we have our game management areas stocked with white-tail deer, wild turkey and small game known to each locale. I live in the very northern part of South Carolina in a place called Spartanburg County. It has been against the law to kill deer in Spartanburg County since game laws came into being. We did not have a deer in Spartanburg County until the South Carolina Wildlife and Marine Resources Department leased some land and stocked it with white-tail deer. We now have as fine a herd of deer as any place in the state. Now I said that to say this, all these clowns who say if you make it against the law to kill a certain animal we will just have these animals everywhere are all wet. It was against the law I know for 50 years and we did not have a deer. Now that we do have some controlled hunting, the deer herd has increased to the point that a person can drive less than ten miles from the city square in Spartanburg and have some of the finest deer hunting of his life. Now why was all this possible? As you know, our biologists don't just come up and look at a piece of land and say they would like to have it in game management, get the owner's permission and then bring in 40 truck loads of deer and turn them loose. A long period of study is involved. Our biologists do an outstanding job in obtaining the land, but before stocking, they plant food patches, and check the environment to see what the carrying capacity might be so that they will not overstock. I have found in talking with some of the Anti-hunters that they don't even know how the game management areas in South Carolina are leased and paid for much less know what the carrying capacity is or anything about our stocking programs.

We as Conservation Officers in my state consider it an honor and privilege to speak to a church group, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, civic clubs, or any other group that will let us tell our story. This is one of the best ways to attack this problem. Speak to any group you can, Civitans, Sertoma, Ruritans, Optimists, Rotary, and win their confidence. Take some time and explain the functions of your department, what we are trying to do and erase this black mark that so many of us carry of being a game warden hiding behind a bush ready to jump on anybody who comes by without a hunting or fishing license. Even though part of that is our job, this profession in my sight carries a much broader scope in this day and time.

The main thing we have to do is take the time to speak to these groups, then after we have presented our individual programs, let them have a question and answer period. Go equipped for this question and answer period that you might be prepared for some questions out of left field. Answer these in a friendly manner with a smile on your face, if possible. If you don't know the answer, don't pretend, tell them simply that you don't know but you will find out and you will either phone them or mail them the information. Here is where we fail so often, promising something and failing to carry it out. When you promise a person that you will do a certain thing, do it. You already have won a friend.

We have a program in my state that is known as Operation Orphan. Our Commission began this program this past summer. I believe they got the idea from the state of Texas. This has been very successful. This program takes children from different orphanages or children's homes and gives them a 2-3 day stay on Belmont Plantation in Hampton County which is owned and operated by the game department for the purpose of research and education. These children stay here and are given the opportunity to learn what our department is doing, learn the art of hunting, gun safety, the art of fishing, shooting rifles on the target area and then to actually participate in deer hunting and some fishing while there at Belmont. This comes about at a very nominal cost but how can we measure the worth of treating an orphan for a couple of days that he'll never forget. There is the point that pays it all. They'll never forget. They'll never forget that we are trying to increase the population of the deer herd. They'll never forget that there were some Conservation Officers who took their time to help a little fellow who had never had a gun in his hand, or who didn't know what a white-tail deer looked like, who saw Bobwhites for the first time in the field and not in a picture, who caught his first fish with the help of some big, ugly Conservation Officer from South Carolina. Gentlemen, there is no way we can place a value on this particular undertaking.

We also are in the process of working in a gun safety program for Boy Scouts or any group of young people or even grown-ups who have never had any training whatsoever with firearms. This includes the formal instruction period in the proper way to handle a gun, loading and handling a gun on the range. The first part of the program will be to let them fire several rounds on the target range. Keep it in your mind that many of these people are handling firearms for the first time in their lives. This will teach them the proper respect of firearms and what they can do if handled improperly. When we have these groups we try to put in a punch for our hunting program.

It's generally true that deer fascinate children more than any species of game that we have in South Carolina so we use them to demonstrate what the department is doing. We try to express to these young people and adults that even though hunting is a recreation or sport, it at the same time serves as a way to thin the deer population to bring it back in the proper balance, or below the carrying capacity. It has been proven over the years by game biologists world renowned that you cannot let game get to the point where they are above the carrying capacity in a certain area because there will not be enough food to go around and the deer will begin to starve. We could talk all day on the deer population and what it would do to the deer population if we agreed that we would not have any more hunting. I am sure men of your caliber and knowledge know what would happen.

I challenge you to do this. Be on your toes! Be ready with the facts and details for anyone who might approach you in a negative manner toward hunting.

One of the things that I would like to bring to your attention that is winning a lot of new members to the Anti-hunting movement is the "gun goons" or people who will shoot anything, any time, anywhere. These people called "gun goons" don't in any way respect the laws of our department or state. They are out to get

into anything that they possibly can. First of all they know if they get caught they are going to be fined or taken to jail, so why should they purchase a license or buy any permits or do anything within the law. These people are hurting the farmer and the land owner and hunting as much as anybody I know. You ask yourself how are they doing this. First of all they will go out and cut the farmer's fences, shoot his livestock. They'll hunt without permission, they'll drive vehicles around property where they are not allowed. They have been known to ruin timber and pulpwood on some property. I probably could go on if I had time but these few things are enough to make anyone get upset and say they don't want hunting on their property ever. In doing so, making this statement, even though involuntarily, this person is in a sense joining the Anti-hunting Movement or let's say he is sympathetic to their cause.

Let's get back to our respective states and respective counties and do the very best that we can to stop the "gun goons." Charge him where possible, put him in jail when necessary, but stop him. He is a menace to our profession.

I know I have taken a lot of time to say a few words but I hope I have said something that might alert some of the noddors in some of the various departments. Let's get out and do what we can for hunting.

I leave you with this one last thought. Something I read in a magazine article some two years ago that has stayed in my mind. The article said that in a projected survey of 1980 on outdoor sports such as hiking, swimming, tennis, golf, etc. fishing in 1980, according to the survey, will be in 8th place on outdoor recreational activities, and hunting is not even in the top 15. Gentlemen, I say it is up to us not to have that nonchalant attitude, not to say I can't afford to get involved because of politics, emotions or whatever, I say now is the time to attack!

*Address by Clark R. Bavin, Chief  
Division of Law Enforcement  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, D.C.  
at the Enforcement Section of the Southeast Wildlife Conference  
October 16, 1973, Hot Springs, Arkansas*

I have enjoyed listening to you discuss the structure and operations of your respective State law enforcement programs. Many of you have stressed the need for change and new approaches in enforcing wildlife laws as well as the need for professionalism. And since we are currently undergoing change both in the kind of personnel and approaches we bring to problems, I welcome the opportunity of Chief Eye's invitation to speak to you today.

In June, I had the honor to speak at the Association of Mid-West Fish and Game Law Enforcement Officers Conference. Since my speech was circulated to a number of States, maybe some of you had the opportunity to read it.

For those of you who didn't, let me briefly summarize for a moment because it might be good background for what I want to talk about today.

We have recently experienced social, political and economic situations never envisioned only a short time ago. And the role of law enforcement officers, whether they be policemen, narcotics agents, criminal investigators or wildlife officers, has changed accordingly.

Research and development of sophisticated new equipment and tools help us do a more efficient job. Computers and other data systems enable us to perform tasks not only more efficiently, they allow us to do some things that were impossible before.

At the State level, responsibilities for wildlife law enforcement have changed dramatically. Rather than the old time game warden type of individual who was

more like a policeman, the modern State wildlife law enforcement officer is a more generalist type of individual. Besides enforcing fish and game codes of his State, he often acts as a wildlife biologist. He is involved in conservation education programs and assists in game management activities. In many States he also enforces boating, pollution, littering, forest fire, and other environmental laws and regulations. We have seen many States change organizationally from a fish and game department to a department of natural resources, where all activities relating to the State's natural resources are included under one organizational head.

At the Federal level changes have also taken place. Our law enforcement programs originated with the Lacey Act of 1900. In those days we employed five law enforcement officers known as Inspectors, Interstate Commerce in Game. Today, we have expanded to where we now enforce ten major Federal statutes protecting fish and wildlife resources through both criminal and civil sanctions. Our enforcement staff has grown to over 200 authorized Special Agents. Although we started out as strictly law enforcement type agents, as our responsibilities grew, we also became involved in wildlife management.

And what I want to talk to you about today is another new direction that we are heading in. The new direction is our response to a variety of new forces which affect the entire wildlife law enforcement profession, both on the State and Federal level. It will require us to work more closely than ever before. This is not a goal. It is an imperative!

It is an imperative because the changing nature of crime and criminals poses new and difficult problems to wildlife law enforcement officers. Today, the "modern" violator is often quite intelligent and especially mobile. A big game hunter from the east can fly to Montana, illegally take a bighorn sheep, and be back home with his trophy the next day. Deer and alligator poachers can transfer animals and hides across State lines in a matter of hours.

We have recently broken up several rings of "trophy killers" where unscrupulous guides and taxidermists are employed by rich men willing to pay up to ten thousand dollars for a record - or as they call it, a "book" - trophy animal.

Working with State law enforcement officers in Louisiana, Florida and other States in the Southeast, we have uncovered and prosecuted an enormous number of alligator poachers and traffickers. Much of this work required investigative techniques and skills not normally utilized by the average wildlife officer. It involved the seizure of large quantities of records and books and then tracking the various transactions through a number of State channels and even in foreign commerce. Likewise, we recently completed a fur investigation in New York City involving foreign commerce transactions where over 60,000 documents were obtained by search warrants and Grand Jury subpoena. It took hundreds and hundreds of manhours for our agents to assimilate the data and match the various transactions in order to substantiate the violations.

And less than two weeks ago our Special Agents testified in a 4½ day criminal trial in New York City in which a prominent live animal dealer was convicted on two counts for falsifying records and checks in an attempt to import 20 live cheetahs under a hardship provision of the Endangered Species Conservation Act. He now faces a maximum ten year prison sentence and a \$20,000 fine. Sentencing will be next month.

In more and more cases the new wildlife criminal is conspiring with others in intricately, well-planned operations. And with increasing frequency, these violations transcend State and national boundaries, often to a number of foreign countries. Local, district and even regional law enforcement coordination is rarely quick enough or prepared to cope with the scope of such problems.

Although neighboring States often cooperate on mutual enforcement

problems, certain types of investigations, especially interregional and those involving States large distances apart are more difficult. Red tape and cumbersome machinery is frequently a discouragement which can prevent apprehension and successful prosecution.

In addition to the changing types of wildlife crime and criminals, there have been other changes affecting our work. In the last 25 years court decisions affecting law enforcement generally have made administration of the criminal justice system complex, difficult, and often frustrating to work with. The nation's concern with the rights of individuals as seen through laws and court decisions concerning search and seizure, arrest and procedures, and interrogations are excellent examples of changes that make practical day to day operations of wildlife law enforcement personnel much different than just a few years ago. Many of our most basic procedures of the past are now out of date, unworkable and in some cases, actually illegal. An officer whose knowledge of the critical areas of the law is limited to that of 1960 is as poorly equipped to do his job today as the doctor, scientist or auto mechanic whose knowledge has not been brought up to date since that year.

As new treaties, laws and regulations increase our responsibilities of wildlife protection, our jobs become even more complex. For example, the Federal Lacey Act of today not only controls interstate commerce in wildlife, it requires us to regulate foreign commerce including importations of wildlife. That is, where an American, or someone under our jurisdiction, is involved in causing to be transported between two foreign countries (or imported into the United States) wildlife that has been taken, transported, possessed or sold in violation of the law of a foreign country, he violates the Lacey Act. This makes it extremely difficult from our standpoint, because we must not only prove the legal elements of importation or foreign commerce, but also the violation of a foreign law.

To further illustrate the magnitude of our Federal enforcement responsibilities, I might add that we are currently holding discussions with other Federal agencies which could result in our agents being required to enforce a treaty involving the protection of wildlife in Antarctica.

These new developments all reflect the changing scope of wildlife law enforcement and place an additional premium on knowledgeable leadership and sophisticated training. In my opinion, they point to the need for speedy nationwide coordination of enforcement, and for nationwide and international exchange of information on wildlife crime and criminal intelligence.

At the Federal level we are making changes in that direction. Of primary importance is the fact that the Federal wildlife law enforcement job is becoming more of a specialization profession. Today, we cannot rely upon the typical generalist of the past to meet the challenges before us. Now, don't misunderstand me, we need people in our organization with wildlife management backgrounds and with experience as State conservation officers and will continue to need them. We need people dedicated to wildlife and environmental protection. But the wildlife law enforcement profession today at the Federal level has become quite specialized in much the same way fisheries and game management have become, and today we need a wider range of knowledge than ever before to meet new demands and challenges of wildlife law enforcement. I believe that with the revitalization and reorganization, we are rising to meet these demands. We are breaking out of the old mold and bringing refreshing new insights and expertise to solve our problems. Today my staff in Washington includes individuals not only with advanced degrees in wildlife management, but with legal backgrounds, experience in police and public administration, criminology and police science. We have former FBI and Treasury agents and military investigators working for us. And we are increasing our

liaison capabilities with other national and international law enforcement organizations.

Next week we will bring on board a new intelligence officer who comes to us with expertise in that field from the International Association of Chiefs of Police. This is the initial step in building a more refined intelligence apparatus which will assist our Special Agents by developing information about violators and potential violators. Next year we plan to hire four new intelligence analysts who will have the task of discerning patterns and trends from the enormous amount of data channeled to us from the field through reports, informants, undercover work and a variety of other sources. A new reporting system is in final stages of development and will insure more uniform information from the field. The information will be stored in a computerized data bank and will enable us to point out activities going on in one State that might affect matters in another. I think the benefits of these new directions for State law enforcement officers are obvious.

While bolstering our field agents with a broader backup support in the Washington Office, we are also supplying them with more sophisticated equipment along with training in criminal procedures, the use of informants and undercover operatives, and in various supervisory and managerial skills of value in the area of criminal investigation.

The changing nature of wildlife law enforcement problems makes it essential that we also adjust certain enforcement techniques and develop new approaches.

One such technique we plan to use more frequently is the strike-force approach. To a very limited degree we have employed it in breaking the alligator cases in the Southeast. Last month, however, we concluded "Operation Rio Bravo" which more graphically demonstrates the flexibility our organization has available. "Operation Rio Bravo" is a code name for our project which was designed to interdict the illegal importation of white-winged doves from Mexico. We had up to 48 agents stationed along 200 miles of the Mexican border from Laredo to Brownsville, Texas, from August 21 to September 17. *This area normally has only two Special Agents assigned to it. Working closely with U.S. Customs Officers, we manned all ports of entry and conducted boat, air and ground patrols. We used informants and other sources of information. To date, we made over 150 cases, seized nearly 5,000 illegal birds, and had fines assessed of nearly \$12,000. Investigations will continue for several months and we expect to document 50-60 additional cases.*

Several months ago, Secretary Reed announced our intent to revise our policy regarding importation of injurious wildlife. Instead of routinely allowing all animals to be imported *except* those already in the country causing damage, we decided to reverse our approach and develop a list of animals we felt presented little or no threat. These "low risk" animals could be imported with a minimum of red tape but the importation of all others would be strictly regulated. Now, you will know from your agonizing experiences with the Red-Whiskered Bulbul and the Walking Catfish, this comes too late for some sections of the country, but I think it illustrates that we are looking ahead and are flexible enough to try new approaches to such matters.

We intend in the coming months to relieve our Special Agents of many of the non-law enforcement duties that they have been performing such as banding of birds, conducting migratory bird surveys and performing certain depredation responsibilities. These responsibilities will gradually be phased-out of the agents duties as other field personnel and programs in our Bureau are able to assume them. There will be no negation of these responsibilities, however, and we are not going to ask State conservation officers to assume these duties. Migratory bird management responsibilities have already been completely removed from my office in Washington and a new Office of Migratory Bird Management

created with total staff responsibility for migratory birds. As we move to reduce the time commitments for these non-enforcement activities, it will free our agents to perform more enforcement-related activities and help in the effort to carry out our total law enforcement responsibilities.

We are not, going to decrease our emphasis on the protection of migratory birds and eagles. In fact, we have intensified the number of investigations in our effort to protect these animals. This has been evidenced during recent years when some of our major eagle cases gained nationwide publicity. Last year, the Eagle Act was amended to provide extra protection for eagles. A number of additional species became protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act when the Mexican Treaty was amended last year and this has further expanded our responsibilities in these areas.

In looking ahead, however, we will attempt to channel our work and emphasize the kinds of investigations and enforcement activities that involve violations having the greatest effect on the resource. For example, in the State of Colorado recently, we investigated several major oil companies that caused over 3,000 migratory bird deaths as a result of certain oil sludge ponds that had been permitted to develop. Criminal charges were filed against six of these firms that resulted in over \$9,000 in fines. Successful operations such as Rio Bravo, the alligator cases, the illegal big game trophy rings and the recent New York fur case have an enormous deterrent value to potential violators which is certainly felt at the local level. I believe that law enforcement must be largely a preventative and deterrent activity aimed at achieving the highest possible degree of public cooperation and understanding. This is why these kinds of large scale illegal activities are our first priority. And because of our broader authority and the nature of our resources, we are better able to focus attention on them. But the priority we give to these types of illegal operations does not in any way discount or subordinate our other law enforcement responsibilities.

I see the new Federal wildlife enforcement role as complementing your State program. We intend to increase our local liaison with the State officer on an Agent-to-Agent basis, as well as at the top level. Broader authority, certain expertise, specialized equipment, and undercover operatives which we can offer, can help you discharge your responsibility toward resident game. We will try to fill in the gaps where the State, by virtue of varying constraints either fiscal, manpower or jurisdictional limits, is prevented from doing the total job.

The new program directions in Law Enforcement that I have been talking about also makes it necessary to make certain adjustments in the field to implement these changes. And I can announce to you today a new restructuring of our field enforcement organization that was just approved by Director Greenwalt last Friday. It will result in a closer contact and a more responsive relationship between our Special Agents and State law enforcement officers.

You know that our Bureau has administered its programs through six geographic regions, each with its own law enforcement supervisor. The Southeast Region for example, is comprised of 10 States, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands with about 50 Special Agents. This means that these 50 agents covering 10 States have been coordinated by one Regional Supervisor in Atlanta - Fred Williams. He has been doing an excellent job, but it is extremely difficult to simultaneously keep on top of developments in areas as far apart as Miami, Louisville and New Orleans. Similar situations exist in other regions. As we have increased the number of Special Agents - 22 this fiscal year - the problems of supervision and management have grown accordingly. Both geographically and functionally there are too many limits.

Under the new structure the six regions in the country will be divided into 13 Law Enforcement Districts, each with its own manager called the Special Agent in Charge who will be responsible to the Regional Director. Here in the



Southeast, instead of having one supervisor coordinating the activities in 10 States, there will be three Special Agents in Charge - each coordinating the activities of smaller geographic areas. The districts in each region, will be further divided into subdistricts. These subdistricts may cut across State lines and will be based on geographical and functional considerations. A Senior Resident Agent will be the first-level supervisor and will coordinate the activities of other Special Agents in a subdistrict. He will have authority to determine where his agents are needed. In other words, when a particular enforcement problem develops in a given area, or when an investigation required additional manpower, the Senior Resident Agent or Special Agent in Charge can move agents from anywhere within the District into these areas until the problem is solved or abated.

In a sense, we will soon have a number of mini-strike forces at the disposal of supervisors which will be able to more quickly and efficiently respond to the needs of their areas. Along these lines, we intend to develop agents with special expertise in specific areas who also can be moved into localities when a unique or unusual problem develops.

The Special Agent in Charge will have primary responsibility to maintain liaison with the States in his District. And as you can see, we are decentralizing our enforcement operations by placing a manager with more responsibility and more authority closer to you.

We are changing. We have in the past and will do so in the future. The changes in society are taking place more rapidly today and we can anticipate the rate will accelerate. And, like the wildlife we protect, we must adapt and evolve. We must remain flexible enough to adjust ourselves and our organizations.

What I am saying here today is the normal result of infusing new ideas, concepts, and techniques and charting new directions for an organization on the move. It is not possible to redirect and revitalize an agency without substantial realignment of personnel. I am not criticizing past efforts, but rather looking to the future and using every available measure to bring about improvements that will keep us abreast of new and demanding challenges.

These changes demonstrate that we are making a very serious and intensive effort to match the very best talent available to us to the particular requirements of the positions and responsibilities involved. They further indicate that we are striving to put our human resources to their best and highest use. And it hasn't been easy.

Our restructuring will mean a realignment of activities into logical manageable combinations that are conducive to group problem solving. With smaller geographic areas of responsibility, a reasonable span of control closer to the States, no constraints of State boundaries and closer contact with State agents, we will now be oriented to address the emerging new problems of wildlife law enforcement. It means a tying together of our activities into a more cohesive force from the regional office on down. And it will mean a harder hitting, more potent Federal force that is more responsive to State problems.

I'm sure we all recognize, there is more of a wildlife enforcement job ahead than any one of us can handle alone. So, we must sort out our responsibilities, our priorities, and continue to join forces in accomplishing our objectives.