

**HJR**

**59**

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA  
2000 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO. HJR 59

Revision Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Title: Support Wildlife + Sport Fish Restoration Act  
 Sponsor: House Resources Committee  
 Requester: H-RCS

Dept. Affected \_\_\_\_\_  
 BRU \_\_\_\_\_  
 Component \_\_\_\_\_  
 Component Serial No. \_\_\_\_\_

Expenditures/Revenues		(Thousands of Dollars)				
OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06
Personal Services	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Travel						
Contractual						
Supplies						
Equipment						
Land & Structures						
Grants & Claims						
Miscellaneous						
<b>TOTAL OPERATING</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES						
----------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

CHANGE IN REVENUES ( )						
------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

FUND SOURCE		(Thousands of Dollars)				
1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF						
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
1037 GF/Mental Health						
1091 Designated Program Receipts						
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

Estimate of any current year (FY98) cost: \_\_\_\_\_

POSITIONS						
Full-time						
Part-time						
Temporary						

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary)

No fiscal impact

Prepared by Lorali Meier, H-Resources Aide  
Lorali Meier

Phone 465-3715  
 Phone \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date 3-20-00

**U.S. House of Representatives**  
**Committee on Resources**  
**Washington, DC 20515**

March 14, 2000

**MAR 20 2000**

Representative Beverly Masek  
State Capitol, Room 128  
Juneau, AK 99801-1182

Dear Representative Masek:

Thank you for supporting my bill, H.R. 3671, the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000. It is my intent to rectify the abuses of the Pittman-Robertson and the Dingell-Johnson Acts. I am committed, with the bi-partisan coalition behind my bill, to ensuring that money collected from sportsmen and sportswomen is not spent wastefully or in ways that are not authorized by law.

H.R. 3671 will benefit Alaskans as well as other sportsmen and women nationwide who pay federal excise taxes on hunting and fishing equipment. This bill will ensure that the money collected will be passed on to the states to be used for on-the-ground fish and wildlife restoration projects.

I am certain that by introducing House Joint Resolution 59, you have aided in the passage of my bill. Again, thank you for your support.

Sincerely,

  
DON YOUNG

# Alaska State Legislature

## House Resources Committee

Co-Chair Beverly Masek  
(907) 465-3715  
FAX (907) 465-4822  
Capitol Building, Room 124  
Juneau, Alaska 99801



Co-Chair Bill Hudson  
(907) 465-6890  
FAX (907) 465-2273  
Committee Meetings  
M/W/F 1 - 3 p.m.

Members: Vice Chair John Cowdery, Representatives: Ramona Barnes, John Harris, Carl Morgan, Jim Whitaker, Reggie Joule, and Mary Kapsner

### SPONSOR STATEMENT

#### **House Joint Resolution 59 "Supporting the passage by the United States Congress of H.R. 3671, the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000."**

HJR 59 demonstrates the Legislature's support for proper use and management of money used to administer the Pittman-Robertson, and Dingell-Johnson Trust Funds.

The Dingell-Johnson Trust Fund was established in 1950. This fund levies a 10% tax on sport-fishing equipment, motor boat fuel, and some boat imports. The Pittman-Robertson Trust Fund, established in 1938, levies an 11% excise tax on sporting arms, ammunition, and other equipment and a 10% tax on handguns. Both acts mandate that the money generated by these taxes be reapportioned back to the states in the form of grants for programs that "benefit fish and wildlife."

In 1999 Congressman Don Young requested the General Accounting Office to audit the Pittman-Robertson administrative fund. Uncovered was waste, fraud, abuse, and mismanagement. Instances include expensive foreign travel junkets and large bonuses for U.S. Fish and Wildlife (USFWS) employees. One career USFWS employee testified before the House Resources Committee that he was pressured to approve hand-outs of Pittman-Robertson money to so-called "animal rights" groups who are actively working to destroy hunting.

Last year, about 15% of Alaskans purchased hunting licenses, and about 30% purchased sport-fishing licenses. This minority deserves the benefits of the Pittman-Robertson and Dingell-Johnson Trust Funds to protect their rights and interests.

FVI - Eddie

Author: Jim Manown at ILA  
 Date: 02/17/2000 8:45 AM  
 Priority: Normal

TO: Mail List - #All NRA Employees at NRA-HUB, #Admin Services at NRA04,  
 Mail List - #Community Services Programs at NRA07, David Brant at NRAHQ,  
 #Competitions at NRA05, #Development at NRA05, Mail List - #Ed & Train at NRA07,  
 #Executive Office at NRA04, Mail List - #Field Operations at NRA07,  
 Tony Ansley at NRAHQ, Tom Audetat at NRAHQ, Marvin Blevins at NRAHQ,  
 David Bundesen at NRAHQ, Donald G. Chilcote at NRAHQ, Gayle Cook at NRAHQ,  
 John Crone at NRAHQ, Richard D'Alauro at NRAHQ, Darren DeLong at NRAHQ,  
 Fred Edgecomb at NRAHQ, Dennis Eggors at NRAHQ, Phil Gray at NRAHQ,  
 Kevin Greb at NRAHQ, Dean Hall at NRAHQ, Al Hammond at NRAHQ, Mike Huber at NRAHQ,  
 Brian Hyder at NRAHQ, Frank Ingrassia at NRAHQ, Todd Johnson at NRAHQ,  
 Dick Kingsafer at NRAHQ, Mike Krei at NRAHQ, Wil Lederer at NRAHQ, David Lee at NRAHQ,  
 Joe Lorsung at NRAHQ, J.P. Nelson at NRAHQ, Carl Provost at NRAHQ,  
 Bill Rawson at NRAHQ, Jay Rusnock at NRAHQ, Larry Tatom at NRAHQ, Rex Thomas at NRAHQ,  
 Tom Ulik at NRAHQ, Kelly Umenhofer at NRAHQ, Janey Wineinger at NRAHQ,  
 #Financial Services at NRA06, #General Counsel at NRA05, #General Ops - Admin at NRA04,  
 #Human Resources at NRA04, #ILA (All Users) at ILA, #Information Services at NRA04,  
 #Law Enforcement at NRA05, #Marketing & Data Analysis at NRA04, #Membership at NRA04,  
 Mail List - #Museum at NRA07, #Publications at NRA03, #Purchasing at NRA06,  
 #Secretary's Office at NRA05, #Treasurer Office at NRA04, #Welcome Center at NRA04,  
 #NRA Board Members at NRAHQ

Subject: NRA News Release on Pittman-Robertson

The following news release is being distributed to the national news media.

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE  
 February 17, 2000

FOR INFORMATION CONTACT:  
 Public Affairs, (703) 267-3820

NRA VOICES SUPPORT FOR HR 3671

(WASHINGTON, DC) -- James Jay Baker, chief lobbyist for the National Rifle Association, today expressed the organization's strong support for H.R. 3671. The Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000 has been introduced by Rep. Don Young (R-AK), Chairman of the House Resources Committee, to protect the interests of sportsmen and address on-going abuse and mismanagement of money used to administer the Pittman-Robertson Trust Fund.

In 1999, at Rep. Young's request, the General Accounting Office audited the Pittman-Robertson administrative fund and uncovered waste, fraud, abuse, and mismanagement involving tens of millions of sportsmen's tax dollars. Instances include expensive foreign travel junkets and large bonuses for U.S. Fish and Wildlife (USFWS) employees. One career USFWS employee testified before the House Resources Committee that he was pressured to approve hand-outs of Pittman-Robertson money to so-called "animal rights" groups who are actively working to destroy hunting. Even worse, another USFWS employee testified that she was directed by high-level Clinton-Gore bureaucrats to destroy computer records that could have shed light on these abuses and on those responsible.

"The administrative abuses uncovered by Representative Young constitute a fundamental breach of trust between America's sportsmen and their government, if not outright illegality," said Baker. "I want to thank him for introducing this important legislation and for his diligence on this issue. Opening day of hunting seasons in America this past year saw nearly twelve million men, women, and children take to the nation's farms, fields, hills, and mountains in active participation in a heritage that is alive and well. The Pittman-Robertson Trust Fund deserves much of the credit for hunting's

continued popularity because it has brought back to abundance numerous game animals. The NRA is gratified to see lawmakers working to insure that the Trust Fund is well managed and continues to benefit wildlife conservation. I am looking forward to working with Congress to get H.R. 3671 passed into law."

Since 1939, the Pittman-Robertson Trust Fund has imposed excise taxes on firearms, ammunition, and, later on, archery equipment. The revenue collected is made available to state wildlife agencies for wildlife restoration projects, hunter safety training, and range construction -- all projects which benefit sportsmen who bear the brunt of the tax. Over 3.5 billion dollars have been collected and dispersed by Pittman-Robertson to state agencies for wildlife restoration projects.

The federal law authorizing Pittman-Robertson allows for money to be set aside to pay overhead costs incurred by the USFWS in administering the fund. However, until last year, the USFWS had never undergone a full-scale audit of its use of the administrative fund. NRA, one of the top national organizations representing sportsmen, has called for several years for a review of how the administrative funds were being used.

-- nra --

**Subject:** [Fwd: 2/16/00 Bill Introduced To Stop Waste Of Fish & Wildlife Funds]  
**Date:** Wed, 16 Feb 2000 13:41:54 -0900  
**From:** Jeff Logan <Jeff\_Logan@legis.state.ak.us>  
**Organization:** Alaska State Legislature  
**To:** Eddie Grasser <Eddie\_Grasser@legis.state.ak.us>

FYI

---

**Subject:** 2/16/00 Bill Introduced To Stop Waste Of Fish & Wildlife Funds  
**Date:** Wed, 16 Feb 2000 17:27:43 -0500  
**From:** "Hansen, Steve" <Steve.Hansen@mail.house.gov>

NEWS Committee on Resources  
U.S. Rep. Don Young (R-Alaska), Chairman  
U.S. House of Representatives - Website address:  
<http://www.house.gov/resources>  
Contact: Steve Hansen (Communications Director)  
(202) 225-7749 or Arturo Silva (202) 225-4063

To: National Desk/Environmental Reporter  
February 16, 2000

Bi-Partisan Legislation To Stop Waste & Mismanagement  
Of Wildlife & Sport Fish Funds Introduced In U.S. House;  
New Bill Caps Administrative Spending & Increases Funding To States

Washington, D.C. - Legislation proposed by U.S. Rep. Don Young (R-Alaska) to stop wasteful spending and mismanagement of wildlife and sport fish restoration funds was introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives today.

The legislation - "The Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000" - (H.R. 3671) was introduced by Rep. Young, the Chairman of the House Committee on Resources, and U.S. Reps. John Dingell (D-MI), Tom DeLay (R-TX), Owen Pickett (D-VA), John Duncan (R-TN), Richard Pombo (R-CA), Helen Chenoweth-Hage (R-ID), George Radanovich (R-CA), Mac Thornberry (R-TX), Bob Schaffer (R-CO), Robin Hayes (R-NC), Michael Simpson (R-ID), Tom Tancredo (R-CO), John Peterson (R-PA), Barbara Cubin (R-WY), and Rick Hill (R-MT).

"One Of The Worst Managed Programs We Have Encountered"  
- General Accounting Office

During three Congressional oversight hearings in 1999, the Resources Committee uncovered numerous spending improprieties involving wildlife and sport fish administrative funds by the Fish and Wildlife Service's Division of Federal Aid. Officials from the non-partisan General Accounting Office were critical of the management of administrative funds by the Division of Federal Aid, stating that "the combined experience of the audit team that did this work represents about 160 years worth of audit experience. To our knowledge, this is, if not the worst, one of the worst managed programs we have encountered."

"The primary goal of this bi-partisan legislation is to prevent tax dollars paid by sportsmen and sportswomen from being wasted, mismanaged and spent in ways that do not help conservation," Young said. "This bill will guarantee the proper use of this money, making additional funding available to each of the 50 states for conservation projects."

"This bi-partisan legislation will amend the Pittman-Robertson and the Dingell-Johnson Acts and put an end to recent practices not authorized

under the Acts - spending conservation dollars on liquor, trips to Japan, slush funds and unauthorized programs and projects, as pointed out by the GAO."

"The administrative funds to run the programs authorized under these Acts were not established to provide a source of extra spending money. If the money wasn't used for administrative purposes, it was supposed to go back to the States."

#### Summary Of New Legislation

The following is a summary of the new legislation:

- \* Caps the amount of administrative dollars for true administration needs to implement the conservation programs. The caps are \$5 million for Wildlife and \$5 million for Sport Fish, for a total of \$10 million a year, for true administration expenses.
  
- \* Defines how administrative funds can be spent, for example: Personnel costs of employees who directly administer the programs under the Pittman-Robertson and Dingell-Johnson Acts
  
- \* Costs to evaluate, approve, disapprove, and advise concerning grant projects to states
  
- \* Overhead costs directly attributable to administration of the programs under the Pittman-Robertson and Dingell-Johnson Acts
  
- \* Auditing costs of each state program on a five year cycle
  
- \* Auditing costs of the funds used for administration
  
- \* Training of Federal and state full-time employees to improve administration and management
  
- \* Costs of travel to the States and territories related to administration of the programs under the Pittman-Robertson and Dingell-Johnson Acts
  
- \* Use of funds for a cost to administer the Act shall not be authorized because the cost is not expressly prohibited by the Act and only costs that are specifically authorized are allowed
  
- \* No funds may be used to supplement any function for which general appropriations are made
  
- \* Establishes a Firearm and Bow Hunter Education and Safety Program Grants to enable States to improve hunter, sporting firearm, bow hunting and archery safety programs and build or improve shooting and archery ranges
  
- \* Authorizes a multi-state conservation grant program to fund wildlife and sport fish conservation projects or programs that will benefit a majority of the states regionally or nationally

\* Establishes an Assistant Director for Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs whose sole responsibility will be the management, administration and oversight of the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs

(For a more comprehensive summary of the legislation, contact Steve Hansen at (202) 225-7749.)

#### Background Information On Federal Aid Program

The Division of Federal Aid of the Fish and Wildlife Service reallocates funds collected through federal excise taxes on guns, ammo, archery equipment and fishing equipment to the States for wildlife and sport fish conservation projects. Of the total collected, Federal Aid is allowed to take up to 8% of the funds reallocated under the Pittman-Robertson Act and up to 6% of the funds reallocated under the Dingell-Johnson Act to "administer and execute" the Acts - to pass the money to the States through grants. The amounts withheld have escalated with the 8% and 6% caps being reached during the last two years. Funds not used to "administer and execute" the Acts are to go to the States for additional wildlife and sport fish restoration projects.

Chairman Young initiated an oversight review of the "administration and execution" expenditures by the Fish and Wildlife Service through its Division of Federal Aid in December 1998 (through GAO) and in March 1999 (through committee investigative staff). GAO and Committee staff encountered a lack of documentation explaining where and how the administrative funds were spent.

The Committee on Resources held three oversight hearings to examine this issue. During the hearings it was revealed that funds withheld by the Fish and Wildlife Service to administer and execute the Pittman-Robertson and Dingell-Johnson Acts were used for expenses not related to the administration or execution of the Acts and funds that were spent on "true administration" were not spent responsibly. In each area where administrative funds were used, there were problems. These include ineffective management oversight, inadequate internal controls, and inadequate policies and procedures for reviewing and approving administrative expenditures. As a result, some of the administrative funds were spent unnecessarily and ineffectively. GAO testified at both hearings that these conditions have spawned a culture of permissive spending that raises significant questions about whether Federal Aid is meeting its management responsibilities.

For more information, please check the House Committee on Resources Home Page at <http://www.house.gov/resources/>

###

Steve.Hansen@mail.house.gov

Committee on Resources

<http://www.house.gov/resources/>

voice: (202) 225-7749

fax: (202) 226-4631

## Committee on Resources

---

### Witness Statement

---

James M. Beers  
Retired Wildlife Biologist,  
US Special Agent, and  
Refuge Manager  
US Fish & Wildlife Service

Testimony before US House of Representatives  
Committee on Resources  
20 July 1999

I am testifying today as a recently retired US Fish and Wildlife Service employee of 31 years. I worked for the Utah Fish and Game while getting my wildlife degree from Utah State University, the best University I could afford in those days. After a stint on a US Navy cargo ship and then on Adak Naval Station as an Officer, I went to work for the US Fish and Wildlife Service as a GS-5 wetland biologist at Devils Lake, North Dakota. I purposely chose the USFWS because I knew the potential for conserving our wildlife heritage for my children and their children was greatest at the Federal level. The pride I felt and the satisfaction I knew during those early years defies description.

My purpose here is to address the use of Federal Aid funds in today's US Fish and Wildlife Service, so let me fast forward to the 80's when I was the Chief of Refuge Operations at the Main Interior Building here in Washington. I was deeply involved in Service budget matters, so that was a frequent topic of conversation both at work and in carpools. Frequent mention was made in those days about the occasional use of Federal Aid funds to buy furniture for the Director and to infrequently pick up odd expenses that the Director had to disguise or for which he did not have other funds available. So far as I knew in those days, the uses of the funds for the Director were neither large (over \$100K) or frequent.

In the early 90's, I was given the opportunity to replace the wildlife biologist in the Federal Aid Washington Office who dealt with the states and all of their larger and shared wildlife issues. Although it was a lateral transfer for me, I looked on it then and now as the greatest job that the FWS had to offer. I was paid entirely out of Pittman-Robertson funds.

Two year later, I was asked to coordinate the efforts of the State Fish and Wildlife Agencies with the State Department and the US Office of Trade Representatives to deal with the European Community regarding their threatened ban of all US fur if we didn't ban leg hold traps. I became a member of the International Standards Organization (ISO) Technical Advisory Group on Humane Trapping Standards. It was a difficult challenge, but one that was worthwhile, necessary, and right for the State Fish and Wildlife Agencies and the trappers, furriers, and even hunters and fisherman who were also threatened by the animal rights activists who were driving the European fur ban.

During this period, I began to see indications of USFWS developing duplicity on this matter. While USFWS assured the State Agencies and their constituents of support, I was hearing from long-time co-workers that there were secret meetings between USFWS and animal rights representatives to agree to strategies to undercut our efforts with the Europeans and ISO. Whenever I asked about this I was greeted only with smiles and statements that there was nothing to it.

One of my other main jobs was annually reviewing applications for Pittman-Robertson (P-R) administrative funds. I would then be the Project Officer for 90% of the approved projects.

Two years ago, I received an application from an anti-hunting and anti-State Fish and Wildlife Agency group that wanted to put together and distribute anti-hunting literature. My hunter-education counterpart received a similar application to compose an anti-hunting education program. Both would have been funded with P-R funds intended to fund State management programs. I found the one I reviewed ineligible on four points from the Federal Register; one was sufficient to bar it from funding. I was badgered and intimidated to change that finding. On one occasion I told a manager to fund it if he wanted to, I would not change my recommendation as the regulations required.

It became clear that USFWS was more and more viewing Federal Aid funding as an Achilles heel of the State management programs benefiting hunters and trappers.

In October of that year, it became evident that our negotiations with the Europeans (and Canadians and Russians) were going to shortly result in an agreement favorable to the United States, the State governments, trappers, and furriers. New and workable humane trapping standards and humane research were the cornerstones of this agreement. In November, the roof fell in on me. I was curtly told I would be moved to a non-existent, lower graded job in Massachusetts! No responsible person in USFWS would openly even greet me, much less offer me any explanation or help. Even State representatives, while personally supportive, were concerned about currying USFWS disfavor since their control of the P-R funds was getting more difficult each year. I was locked out of my office, the police came to the building to keep me from entering, and I was threatened in an unmarked envelope left in my front door on a Sunday morning with the loss of my retirement for five years and the loss of my health coverage forever if I did not retire immediately.

I am currently retired, but I spent my last eight months at home with no work from or communication with USFWS. Newspaper articles and the National Wilderness Institute focussed public attention on my dilemma and irregularities at USFWS. I was very fortunate to have obtained a very able lawyer who represented my interest impeccably. The resolution of my status was due to the help of many concerned people.

During my years in Federal Aid, I witnessed a growing disdain for any responsibility for how they spent P-R funds withheld to administer the Act. What years ago had bought furniture for the Director, began to be used to pay for personnel in other programs such as Fisheries when funds were short from Congress and to hide public affairs personnel when Congress directed the numbers to be maintained. Right up to two years ago, Public Affairs personnel who were not engaged in anything to do with administering the Act were paid entirely out of Federal Aid funds. The regulations at this time forbid THE STATES from two things law enforcement and public relations (unless approved by a USFWS regional director). Solicitors told USFWS that those admonitions did NOT apply to USFWS use of administrative funds.

Coincident with the growing culture of no holds barred use of P-R administrative funds, USFWS decentralized. No longer did any one Division Chief in Washington oversee funding of each budget category. It only took a year or so for Regional Directors to mimic the Washington use of FA slush funds. Soon Special Projects, new offices, and new ecosystem managers and offices were receiving varying amounts of P-R life support. That is where we find ourselves today.

I fought the USFWS openly for over a year regarding the forced transfer. I still take blood pressure medicine. The sleepless nights and helpless feelings that I experienced will always be with me. I told the story I have told here to lawyers, auditors, investigative agencies, and anyone else who would listen. Let

me tell you, there are lots of people in government and in private organizations who are aware of these abuses and outraged by them. Those in government are rightly fearful. Those in State agencies likewise must depend on their unfaithful USFWS partners. Those in private organizations write and talk about their outrage at the misuse of these funds and their use to undercut State management programs.

Only Congress can do something real. To quote a State representative familiar with this business, It's so rotten, the only way to fix it is to start over. I recommend that administration of the Act (and the Sport Fish Restoration Act and any non-game management Act that might emerge) be given to an office or agency that does not duplicate the work of the State Agencies. For instance, if someone as far afield as say Agriculture or Treasury were to utilize P-R funds for their own purposes, it would be much more apparent as a diversion from the Congressional intent for State management programs.

The Agency, or office, that administers the Act should only take the funds necessary to apportion the funds to each state, approve projects, audit routinely each state, and provide such coordination and national efforts as needed AND REQUESTED by the states through their International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies. All remaining funds should go to the States.

Today the Service uses 8% of the available funds annually. Years ago, the legislative history mentions how the first amount considered for administration was 10%. Some Congressmen thought 5% would be more than enough since similar programs used less than 4%. They wanted the sort of premiere program that was Federal Aid for many years so they settled on 8%. Until recently, administration was only a 3-4% thing and this program was hailed far and wide as a model for other countries. User pays never worked better. Three to four percent should be the limit available for administering the Acts. Any more should only be at the request of the States for specific multi-state problems.

While discussing these Federal problems, we should not forget to consider legislative remedies for the problems State agencies face today. The same groups that are working surreptitiously at the Federal level are working at the State level to eliminate management programs funded by P-R dollars. In order to maintain the integrity of the Federal Aid program and active management of wildlife, I would submit the following for your consideration.

First, with the recent spate of ballot initiatives to ban cougar hunting, trapping of furbearers, etc., the question arises should P-R money be used to manage these species where States have elected to remove the citizens' ability to harvest those species? The law should recognize the right of States to ban such legitimate harvests by hunters or trappers but also forbid the use of P-R funds to manage or control such species in those States after they take such actions.

Second, future non-game or OCS funding should not be matched by States with any sport license money unless and until all available P-R and D-J apportionment's are matched. Non-game efforts should not be made with the funds generated by species which are utilized directly by men and women and children in so many direct ways.

Last, the P-R law should define wildlife restoration projects like the D-J law does. That is to say, sport animals, like sport fish and their habitats, should be the focus of such projects. If States wish to do more worthwhile non-game projects, they should be done with money from their supporters and not by using Federal Aid money generated by sports men and women who have the reasonable expectation that such moneys will be returned to maintain their pursuits and the habitats which support them.

I dedicated my professional career to wildlife conservation. I am appalled at the way I see conservation funds being looted and used to fund government and private efforts to undercut hunting, fishing, trapping,

and the State agencies that manage them. Today's USFWS is fostering an agency-wide climate that promotes these diversions and abuses. The Division of Federal Aid is currently filling the two-year vacant Hunter Education job in Washington. It is described strictly as an education job with no State, hunting, or fishing experience necessary. Imagine the mischief that will generate. The Refuge Division acquires new refuges and eliminates beneficial consumptive uses without reason or justification. The Law Enforcement Division promises State administrators and trappers that they will not license or tax individual trappers exporting furs to Canada; then, when they do tax them, they claim it's a mistake and they will change it; then, after about a year, they say Congress made them do it and it can't be changed. The migratory bird managers are proposing to spend millions of recently found migratory bird funds, not on waterfowl habitat, but to buy a Pacific Island. In my opinion, they are changing the historic and legislative-based mission of the Service without benefit of Congressional or citizen knowledge or input.

The sense of duty and purpose that I brought to USFWS back in Devils Lake is still alive. I retired on 3 June, but I didn't leave the USFWS; they left me. I ask your help to get them back on track. They had a very important mission and some pretty outstanding employees.

Thank you.

###