

travel and expenses, and the initiation of new training programs for Federal and States employees.

These moves indicate to me that the Service is aggressively taking action to clean up this mess. Has the Service acted quickly enough to address these problems? Certainly not. But is the Fish and Wildlife Service now making a serious effort to clean up the administration of these programs? I believe they are. It is unfortunate the majority has decided to ignore these internal reforms.

Which brings us to where we are today. When the majority concluded its investigation, I hoped that we might be able to work to draft legislation sufficiently tailored to ensure long-term financial accountability of this program. But so far we have been unable to do that.

I have several concerns about this legislation. Foremost is my concern that the bill would severely cut the amount of allowable funding for the Service to administer the program. As reported by the Committee on Resources, the bill would have established a \$10 million per-year cap to fund administrative activities which the majority claims would track existing costs for legitimate administrative functions. However, the Fish and Wildlife Service indicates that the personnel costs alone amount to \$9.5 million annually.

Furthermore, when the service analyzed past spending, organized by the majority's own 12 expense categories, and when the Service backed out the illegitimate expenses, the costs for administration consistently ranged between \$20 million to \$25 million. Clearly, \$10 million is simply not sufficient to engage in the proper practices.

It is my understanding that the funding levels imposed by this cap would force the Service to terminate anywhere between 40 to 60 Federal Aid employees. In addition, the caps would also force the Service to cut back on important administrative activities, including State grant audits, budget oversight, and procedural training for Federal and State personnel. How is the Service supposed to provide increased oversight, accountability, and services to the States under this scenario?

I ask if my colleagues' offices would be able to provide the same level of services to their constituents if they were forced to cut their office staff and operating budgets by 30, 40 or 50 percent? Of course not. But that is what this legislation would impose on the Service.

I am also concerned the bill does not provide any administrative flexibility for the Fish and Wildlife Service to respond to unknown future expenses that could be imposed on the Service. For example, if the CARA legislation should pass, it would allocate an additional \$350 million to the Pittman-Robinson programs, but it would not allow any additional funding for that pro-

gram. I hope we can either address that problem in this legislation or in the follow-along CARA legislation.

I find it remarkable that the majority insists that the workload of the program could virtually double overnight but would not provide additional administrative funds to the program.

I am also concerned that the bill does nothing to ensure the States who receive Federal funds are held accountable on how they spend their grants. After all, the States receive 93 percent of all the Federal Aid funds, roughly \$450 annually. Yet the audit of State programs has uncovered many troubling examples of financial abuse, very similar, if not identical, to the problems uncovered in the Federal investigation of the Federal agency.

I find it interesting that the committee would focus its attention exclusively on how the Fish and Wildlife Service spends its funds, which total about \$31 million, but fail to address the credible evidence of similar financial mismanagement among the States that spend more than 10 times that amount of money.

Perhaps this indifference reveals the true nature about this legislation. It is less about the avoidance of spending money unlawfully than it is about punishing the Service.

I am disappointed that we have been unable to resolve these substantial concerns and other problems that I have raised with this legislation. I would have preferred to resolve these matters before bringing the bill to the floor. Hopefully, they will be resolved before this legislation is reported from the Senate.

I would hope that the majority would understand that to seek signature on this legislation some of these concerns, that are legitimately raised by the Fish and Wildlife Service, by some of the State agencies, and by supporters of this program, will have to be changed if the agency is, in fact, going to effectively administer the Office of Federal Aid; and if they are going to be able to administer the programs as we on the committee now agree they should be, which resulted from the hearings and the investigations that the majority led into this agency.

I guess, in short, I would simply say this: I believe this legislation is on the right track, but I believe it is overkill.

□ 1600

I believe it is overkill, to the extent to which it can render the agency ineffective to do exactly the mission that is outlined in this reform legislation.

I would hope that the principals of this legislation could work out so there could be sufficient funding that would allow the agency to do its job properly, there would be the reforms that the legislation speaks to to make sure that, in fact, monies are spent properly for the purposes for which people pay into this fund and for which those of us who make the policy on this matter expect them to be paid.

The agency must be allowed to function, and I would hope that those needs could be addressed.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally to receive a message.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington) assumed the Chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

WILDLIFE AND SPORT FISH RESTORATION PROGRAMS IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2000

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the great leader in the House.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, last year, congressional Republicans fought tooth-and-nail to cut waste, fraud and abuse out of a bloated Federal budget. We were successful, but we have only just begun.

This year we remain vigilant in our crusade to return accountability to the Federal Government, and, today, thanks to the chairman of the Committee on Resources (Mr. YOUNG), we are taking another important step by bringing this bill to the floor.

This measure will eliminate waste, fraud and abuse at the Fish and Wildlife Service and restore integrity and accountability to our conservation programs.

Last century, America's sportsmen agreed to excise taxes on sporting equipment so that others could enjoy hunting, fishing, and other outdoor activities. In doing so, they placed their trust in the Federal Government to administer these funds, their hard-earned dollars, for State conservation efforts.

This system worked for decades, but this administration has shattered that trust. A yearlong committee investigation revealed that half the money set aside to administer these programs, over \$15 million, was improperly used.

But do not just take my word for it. The GAO report, and I quote, "to our knowledge, this is, if not the worst, one of the worst managed programs we have encountered."

Mr. Chairman, this bill ensures that the government manages the people's money wisely. I urge my colleagues to support this bill and restore trust between America's sportsmen and their government.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from California for yielding me the time.