

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.

Mr. Chairman, while I support this bill, I do have some concerns about it, and at the appropriate time, I will offer an amendment that I think can set the stage for addressing those concerns.

As the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and others have noted, this bill was prompted by information developed by the Committee on Resources through the oversight process.

As a result of that oversight, it became clear that it would be desirable to revisit the underlying statutes at issue here; although, I think it is also clear, as my colleague from California suggests, that some of the charges about the actions of the current administration have been exaggerated, and that those folks making those charges have failed to point out similar actions that occurred during prior administrations.

The programs of assistance to state and wildlife agencies addressed by this bill are very valuable for my home State of Colorado and, of course, for all the other States that make up our union. This bill deals with a very important subject that deserves careful scrutiny by the Committee on Resources and by the whole House itself.

I do think that Congress does need to reconsider the degree of discretion that current law allows the Interior Department with regard to the administration of these programs.

However, in responding to the ways the Interior Department has used its discretion in the past, I fear that the bill may go too far in the other direction.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly understand the purpose of limiting the amount of money that can be spent on administration, because obviously, what is spent that way will not be available for the substantive purposes of the programs, but at the same time, we need to recognize the administration is necessary and adequate administration is essential to avoid the risk of misuse of taxpayer funds, either by the Department of Interior or by other parties.

That is why I am concerned when the Interior Department says that limits set by the bill would likely require reduction in the number of people who would administer these programs because adequate staffing is necessary to administer any program.

I am also concerned that the bill's provisions are too inflexible and too detailed and that even more specific requirements are suggested in parts of the committee's report on the bill.

Accountability is essential, but excessive paperwork for its own sake can eat up resources that could be put to more productive uses. And I do not think we should make it impossible for the Interior Department to respond to new developments, such as the very significant and very desirable increase in the scope of these programs that would come from the enactment of H.R. 701, the CARA legislation which the Committee on Resources has already approved, and which I hope will

come to the floor of the full House in the near future.

As I said, I support the bill. I will do so not because I think it is perfect, but because I think it is desirable to make some progress on this subject.

It is my hope that we can further refine the bill as we proceed through the legislative process with the other body and, if necessary, in conference. However, should that not occur, our committee and the House may be better advised to return to this subject next year.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to remind both of my speakers on that side of the aisle my amendment raises the fund from \$10 million to \$14 million with a \$5 million grant that is \$19 million, and I had information from the Department that said that they could operate very well with \$19 million.

We expect a decrease of personnel probably of 23 members of the total aid program, and that is all. What we are trying to do here is not this administration is future administration, this administration is on its waning days, but future administration, regardless of parties, will not have the opportunity to use these dollars that are paid in good faith by the sportsmen of America and then misspent.

Even those within the agency today have told me privately, yes, they made a mistake, and they really would suggest that we are doing the correct thing. We will review this. We will have a very simplistic audit system. I have agreed to that. We will work with those people involved and make sure that in the future time, we will be able to see where they have been able to reach those goals.

In closing, may I suggest, I have asked them time and time and time again give me the figures where they need it and how they want to spend it, and the agency itself has been reluctant. In fact, they have stonewalled us. I am trying to get those figures. I am working very hard.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN).

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the accountability and responsibility to stop wasteful spending and mismanagement of wildlife and sport fishing funds. The impropriety of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in spending taxpayer dollars for slush funds and unauthorized programs and projects is an abuse that must come to a stop.

The Service has failed to return leftover funds to the States for conservation purposes, funds paid by sportsmen and sportswomen. Even worse, the General Accounting Office has acknowledged that in its 106 years of experience, this is what it said, it said "this is, if not the worst, one of the worst managed programs." That is a quote that they have given, and that is the

way they feel. And I believe that that is accurate.

We have an opportunity to provide oversight to a program in desperate need of reform. The Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act would return honesty and responsibility to the administration of the programs under the Pittman-Robertson and Dingell-Johnson Acts.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to support this measure that not only reduces bureaucracies but prevents waste, fraud, and abuse.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may assume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) who has been obviously a very strong supporter of this program and a strong voice for reform.

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) for his kindness to me in this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the attention of the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), my good friend, the chairman of the committee, but before I do so, I want to pay tribute to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the committee, and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), my good friend, for the fine leadership they have given in working this bill to this point on the House floor.

It is an important piece of legislation. It enhances and protects a great national treasure which are the different Federal aid to fish and wildlife programs which have existed for a long time.

I am particularly proud that one of these was the Pittman-Robertson bill, which takes care of grants to the States for aid for wildlife conservation and, of course, Dingell-Johnson which was sponsored by my old dad some 50 years ago, which protects fish and fishery resources.

This is the kind of bipartisanship that has always been shown during this legislation. It does both of these gentlemen and the committee great credit, and I want to commend them and thank them for what it is they have done and for working with me on this matter.

Mr. Chairman, one matter not addressed in the bill, I believe, would be very important in the entire question of administration of Federal aid program, is an independent outside top-to-bottom review to determine how many people are needed to administer it and what mixture of skills they should have. Your able staff has undertaken to develop a staffing model, and Fish and Wildlife has offered what they believe is an appropriate level of funding.

I do believe that an outside review by experts without any stake in the outcome would be beneficial.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I agree it is my understanding that the Fish and Wildlife Service has authority to undertake this review in a fairly rapid manner. My only concern that any review is truly independent of undue influence. For that reason, I agree with you provided the service and the reviewer consult with the House Committee on Resources prior to and during the review.

The committee must agree with the parameters of the review and we must be advised of the process of the review.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I agree with my good friend that the Service should, in fact, start such a review. It is my hope that that will take place and that they should make every effort to have it completed within 120 days and to be without any taint of outside influence.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I strongly agree with that but with the understanding the review does not stand in the way of getting this bill enacted into law. I want to make sure we go forth with the law, the review can come after the law, because I am looking at the next administration, we do not want the abuse that occurred in the past administration.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I do want to thank my good friend, I want to continue my comments, and I am going to try and watch my time very closely. I say to my good friend, the ranking member. These are important programs. They are great national treasures and they are a curious example of legislation which is protected by people who pay taxes, and the taxpayers and the sportsmen who pay the taxes are those who are the strongest supporters of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman for having this GAO accounting and I want to commend him for the work which he has done to present this legislation to the House. I would like to observe that the situation has gotten into a bad state, and I would like to make an observation that this is regrettably something which does continuously require the attention and the oversight of the Congress.

I would like to observe that the situation that has been brought to light is not a good one, and it is one which desperately needs correction for the protection of the fish and wildlife resources to which these monies will be put.

I would like to observe, however, that a lot of time that programs of this kind become the subject of abuse simply because the appropriators and the Committee on the Budget are often times responsible for seeing to it that these monies become the go to fund for initiatives and expenses that were

never authorized by Congress or programs that Committee on Appropriations sort of deals with a wink and a nod or the Committee on the Budget does to see to it that these monies are spent in a way that the legislative committee never intended.

Mr. Chairman, certainly, that is a bad situation and hopefully, this legislation will help to bring that kind of situation under control. The basic program is, however, a sound one and a good one. I believe that the limitation on expenditures for administrative purposes and others is a good one.

It may, perhaps, need to be increased, but at least at this time it is a useful device, not only to curb abuses within the agency, but also to curb abuses by the Congress and by the appropriators and by the Committee on the Budget enforcing the use of these kinds of monies for purposes that the legislative committees have never intended should be the expenditure.

Having said that, I would observe that I believe that as the process goes forward that this Congress will work together to achieve a resolution of any differences and difficulties that exist across the aisle or between different Members. I am satisfied that as we work this legislation out, it will come to be something which will be the protection of a great national treasure.

I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and I thank my good friend, the ranking minority member, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) for making this time available. I look forward to working together with them and with others to see that this is the legislation we want it to be.

□ 1615

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU).

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the legislation brought before us by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Resources. The facts that led to this legislation really do speak for themselves: skyrocketing overhead costs in an important Federal program, payment for foreign travel completely unrelated to the nature of the work of the Federal Aid Program, and the use of funds to pay employees that were not even working within the program itself.

Clearly this is necessary legislation to protect the financial interests and restore financial accountability to a very important Federal program. Contrary to the suggestion that we might be injecting too much oversight or too much financial accountability into this program, I think it understands the need for more such oversight, and the gentleman has done us a service in beginning this process. Identifying waste and mismanagement in government is not just a good idea, but it is in the best interests of the taxpayers and really the future of this country because every time we find opportunities

to save taxpayers not millions, but in the aggregate it adds up to billions, that is additional resources that we can invest in programs that really do work for the American taxpayer, or it is money that we can actually let the taxpayer keep and never even have to send to Washington, investing in what they care about.

I applaud the work of the gentleman from Alaska; I applaud the Speaker and Members on both sides of the leadership that have called for greater oversight of waste and mismanagement in government in the hope that it will lead to a much better investment of those taxes that we do collect here in Washington.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD).

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act authored by the gentleman from Alaska, the chairman of the Committee on Resources. As a member of that committee and of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus, I commend the gentleman from Alaska for crafting this truly "good government" bill.

I was born, raised, and have lived most of my adult life in rural Pennsylvania. I was taught to hunt and fish at a young age. With that knowledge came a great amount of respect for the game that we hunted, a love of the outdoors, and a desire to ensure that our wildlife resources are managed and preserved for future generations to experience. All those sportsmen over the years who have paid in their excise taxes to the Pittman-Robertson and Dingell-Johnson funds think of those funds the same way that Social Security recipients think of the funds they have paid in.

I am appalled that we seem in this Chamber to think that it is all right that there is some mismanagement of those funds. It is not all right. It is our job to do something about it. I do not think we should take any comfort in the fact that maybe the States have not done their job as well as they should. This is the right thing to do. Mr. Dingell, Sr., would be appalled if he knew that these funds would be used as slush funds or unnecessary foreign travel or unreasonable overhead costs. Like the Social Security fund, this needs to be very well managed. The bottom line is that this bill will increase the amount of money currently available for conservation by eliminating waste, fraud and abuse. This is good environmental policy, and it is good fiscal policy. I again commend the gentleman from Alaska for the leadership in bringing this to the floor. I ask for its passage.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

(Mr. KIND asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time. As a member of the Committee on Resources, I rise in support of H.R. 3671, legislation to improve the financial management and accountability of the Office of Federal Aid within the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Under current law, the Office of Federal Aid reallocates funds collected through Federal excise taxes on guns, ammunition, and archery equipment to individual States for fish and wildlife restoration projects. Hunters and outdoorsmen as well as recreation and conservation groups in my district in western Wisconsin and throughout America rely on these restoration projects to improve habitat and fishable waters.

Unfortunately, recent evidence documented by the GAO indicates that the administration and financial oversight of the Federal aid in the wildlife and sport fish restoration program may be a little lax. This has resulted in the unfair public perception that misallocation and abuse has occurred throughout the Fish and Wildlife Service. To correct this problem, H.R. 3671 caps the amount of administrative dollars available for administration use to implement wildlife and sport fish restoration programs.

While I support this legislation, I do share the concern of the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) that this bill as currently written may go too far and end up restricting the overall effectiveness of the fish and wildlife restoration programs. In fact, there may be some truth in the fact that the rigid budgetary framework that this legislation proposes may ultimately erode the capabilities of the Fish and Wildlife Service to effectively administer the restoration programs. To that end, it is my hope and desire that the Senate can correct some of the flaws that I believe currently exist with this legislation so that the President may ultimately sign it into law.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN).

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Chairman, like most Americans I was disappointed and angry to hear of the administrative abuses taking place under the Pittman-Robertson and Dingell-Johnson Acts. These are very popular programs that I support, which permit collection of funds through the Federal excise taxes on hunting and fishing equipment, a worthy cause, and two activities that my family holds dear, that my entire family enjoys as do the vast majority of the people in my State of Wyoming. These funds are tremendously beneficial to the State and to other States that use them for on-the-ground fish and wildlife conservation projects.

The House Committee on Resources learned of the mismanagement of the 6 percent and the 8 percent administra-

tive funds over a year ago. Since that time, the GAO and the Committee on Resources' own review of the mismanagement indicates that widespread abuses have continued to be discovered. It is my understanding that part of these funds were even used to introduce the wolf into Yellowstone which was something the States of Wyoming, Idaho, and Montana; the governors; and the legislatures strongly opposed, as did most of the people that lived there. The plain truth is that the Fish and Wildlife Service has misused millions of taxpayer dollars.

I have to say that I find it a little less than amusing that in this Chamber the misuse of these funds has been characterized as "exaggerated" and the previous speaker saying the administration "may have been a little lax" when in fact the GAO report says that this program, quote, "if not the worst managed, is one of the worst managed programs we have ever seen."

Now, excuse me. Hello? That is worse than "maybe a little lax" or that the other side is exaggerating this problem. When money is misused that taxpayers pay in under certain circumstances, it should be distributed according to the law. Sportsmen and women have every right to expect that their hard-earned money will be returned to them in the form of the services for which they pay it. Clearly this kind of abuse cannot be justified, and it cannot be tolerated.

As an original cosponsor of the legislation of the gentleman from Alaska, I am committed to bringing an end not only to this particular kind of Federal abuse of dollars but other abuses that are prevalent in our Federal Government. I do not care who is in office, I do not care who is in the seat of the presidency, I do not care who is in the majority of the Congress. To say that just because they did it means it is not so bad that we did it is ludicrous. I am offended by that as every American should be.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Let me just say, this is not about whether or not we support or agree with the waste of money, because obviously nobody in this Chamber does and nobody in the Congress does; and the hearings that we had in the Committee on Resources were for the purposes of stopping those practices that were unacceptable. But the fact of the matter is the numbers that the GAO threw around have never been substantiated.

The suggestion that somehow these individuals were engaged in illegal or criminal behavior has never been substantiated, was never found to be true; and we ought to set the record straight. The fact that that did not happen does not mean this was the best-run program, but it also certainly means this was not the worst-run program. We can show you many unfortunately tragically that are far worse than this that do not deal with several

million dollars, but deal to the tune of billions of dollars of waste. That is a tragic fact. But the point is the record ought to be straight on this one so that the remedy fits the problem, and the concern about this legislation at this moment is that this legislation overreaches and in fact will keep the agency from doing what all of us in this Chamber want them to do.

Speaker after speaker has gotten up here and made the point that this is a highly successful program; they have had great results in States building local programs for hunters and for fishers, and it is working. We have all had testimony to it in our States and in many of our districts where these programs have been utilized in conjunction with many local organizations. This is a successful program. We ought not in terms of being a little overzealous here then cripple the agency from doing what it is doing very well apparently.

We ought to address ourselves to those problems that are in fact real and ought not to be allowed to continue, but we ought not to overreach and do as many who are strong supporters of both this legislation and this program suggest may very well happen if some of these numbers are not moved up so the agency has the money necessary to properly administer the program which brought us to this point originally.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I appreciate the gentleman's comments; but I would suggest again with my amendment, the administration and the agency itself had said that they will reach the \$19 million and we will only lose, if anything, none this time, all existing programs continue, and next year 10 people are lost, 10 after that, 20 in total; but we will have an accounting, and they will not have this fund which they can use. Remember, this is for the next administration. If there is a problem they cannot implement it because of this legislation, we always can address that. But I do not want anybody to be able to get into that cookie jar. As we remember in 1992, only 2 percent was used for administrative costs; and beginning in 1993 and on, it went up to the full 14 percent. So I do not want that to occur, because there is no justification for that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE).

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to thank the gentleman from Alaska and his staff for their hard work and vigilance in pursuing this issue and in drafting legislation to fix what GAO has characterized, there is no way around this, as one of the worst-managed programs that they have ever encountered. Unfortunately for sportsmen and women across South Dakota and around this country, the

Fish and Wildlife Service has misused at least \$45 million of these funds by directing portions of the excise tax dollars toward such things as a slush fund for the director and foreign junkets entirely unrelated to the administration of the program.

As a result of these abuses, States have not been able to conduct wildlife and sport fish projects because the funds were spent in ways in which the Congress did not authorize.

□ 1630

As an avid sportsman, I am outraged by the abuses that have been uncovered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), and the Committee on Resources, and I am not alone. What is going on here is unconscionable. I have received a lot of letters and e-mails and phone calls from sportsmen and women across South Dakota asking me to take action to stop the Fish and Wildlife Service's abuse of administrative funds by the Division of Federal Aid. This bill does just that.

Mr. Chairman, this was a successful program because sportsmen and women were generous in their willingness to pay the excise taxes which they paid, believing that those taxes were going to be used to invest in wildlife and sports fish. Had they known that the money they were paying in excise taxes was going to be used by Fish and Wildlife Service at its disposal for a lot of these inappropriate expenditures, I doubt they would have been willing to pay those taxes. This bill prevents the director from using administrative funds for purposes other than legitimate costs to administer the law.

Mr. Chairman, this is no way to administer a program. The sportsmen and women whose tax dollars fund this program expect and deserve more from their government. It is the job of each and every one of us in this Chamber to ensure that the taxes paid by the American people are not squandered. Whether they be sportsmen excise tax dollars or any other tax dollars, we have a responsibility to the American people to do the right thing, and the right thing is to pass this bill.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, what is wrong with this microphone? I am getting a little tired of it. Whoever is running this thing had better be on the ball, because this thing never goes on on time and some of the time we cannot hear anybody, and maybe that is on purpose. But we have spent an awful lot of money on this project, brand-new, and I have been here and listening to this and it is not properly run and it deeply disturbs me.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's concerns are duly noted by the Chair.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise today in support of H.R. 3671. As cochairman of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus, I can tell my colleagues few issues are as important to the caucus as safeguarding the integrity of the Pittman-Robertson and Dingell-Johnson funds. So important that this is one of the primary missions of the Sportsmen's Caucus which now includes 280 Members of Congress.

I was happy to support the gentleman from Alaska when he introduced this bill, and I am happy to support his effort today to move this needed legislation forward. His bipartisan approach is appreciated in the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus.

The Chairman's committee has built an excellent case for making the reforms he offers in the House today. For years, there has not been enough oversight over this program and these conservation trust funds. The chairman took a hard look at this issue, and what he found surprised all of us who, for decades, have happily contributed the funds for this valuable program.

This oversight found loose language within the law regarding administration and execution of the wildlife and sport fish trust funds. The proposal today tightens it. Where his oversight found waste, this bill eliminates it.

The gentleman's bill also directs resources to hunter education and safety, something that the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus cares about deeply. It is important that funding is provided to both educate hunters and to ensure their safety in the field.

This will also maintain the vitality of the Pittman-Robertson fund by continuing to bring in new generations of hunters, something that we are all trying to make happen.

So, Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill, and I urge my colleagues to adopt it.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), cochairman of the Sportsmen Foundation, 280 members now, and a great leader for the sportsmen's movement in the Congress.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Alaska for bringing this bill forward.

Mr. Chairman, since coming to Congress, I have been committed to reducing Federal spending and balancing the Federal budget. As cochairman of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus along with my good friend from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON), I have worked in a bipartisan fashion to promote hunting, fishing, and other outdoor recreational activities. But we could not be nearly as successful in the Sportsmen's Caucus were it not for the Pittman-Robertson and Dingell-Johnson Trust Funds. These funds have given millions of sportsmen and women the opportunity to continue to enjoy their hobbies of hunting and fishing and provide steady streams of revenues to fund hunter education and safety programs.

When sportsmen and women buy fishing equipment, guns, ammunition or

archery equipment, a portion of their proceeds go to the States to help wildlife restoration or conservation projects and hunter education. This is not complicated. This is not rocket science. This is no secret. This is a win-win for everyone who cares about wildlife, who cares about hunting and fishing, who cares about education, about hunter safety, and about other education regarding outdoor activities.

That is, until some Washington bureaucrat thought they could take some of that money and use it for different purposes, purposes like travel to Japan, and creating a huge unauthorized slush fund. We are talking about at least \$45 million in misspent, unauthorized costs of this program.

I say to my colleagues, this program is not going to be a slush fund for Washington bureaucrats, and I hope that bureaucrat is listening today, because with passage of this bill, we will ensure the integrity of Pittman-Robertson and Dingell-Johnson Trust Funds. We will ensure that they are protected for the American outdoorsman and the American taxpayer.

This Congress is committed to cutting out fraud, eliminating waste, and ending abuse of the American tax dollar. This is exactly what this bill intends to do. It protects the integrity of these quality trust funds in a way that makes common sense.

Instead of depending on a bureaucrat at the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to audit its own administrative costs of the program, we cap the administrative costs. We put the auditing in the hands of an independent inspector general, and we will require regular reporting to Congress of those audits.

Mr. Chairman, the Wildlife and Sports Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000 will prevent dollars paid by sportsmen and sportswomen from being spent in ways that do not benefit wildlife, sport fishing, and related restoration efforts and will send more money to States for them to use for conservation projects and hunter education.

I applaud my friend, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) for bringing this issue to the forefront. I applaud him for authoring this very common sense, good government piece of legislation, and I urge its passage.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON). It seems like great Americans have the name "Peterson."

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) for the time, and I want to commend him and the committee for their oversight.

We do not do enough of that here. I think the American public would be a lot more comfortable with their Federal Government if we did more oversight. I am a little taken aback though by some of the comments that I have heard in this debate that this might go too far, this is too tough. Let us just

look for a moment at what the GAO report says.

It says, controls over expenditures, revenues, and grants were inadequate. Millions of dollars in program funds could not be tracked, millions. Basic principles and procedures for managing travel funds were not followed. Basic internal control standards or Office of Management and Budget guidance for maintaining complete and active grants files were not followed. Regional offices used administrative funds inconsistently and for purposes that were not justified. Charges for service-wide overhead may be very inaccurate. Routine audits to determine whether administrative funds were being used for authorized purposes were not conducted, and the process for resolving audit findings involving States' use of program funds was very questionable.

This is no way for programs to be administered. I am sure this is not the only one, but I want to commend the committee for tracking it down and changing it. Sportsmen and women who fund this program with their tax dollars expect more from their government. It is our job to ensure that their tax dollars are not squandered, and they go to wildlife and sports fish restoration projects. This bill will make sure that the taxes paid by our sportsmen and women are used efficiently and according to the law, and that the majority of the funds go to the States to fund the appropriate programs.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank this committee for a job well done.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES), who visited Alaska to make his fortune and returned home.

(Mr. HAYES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to address the Members of the House regarding a very fiscally responsible bill, and I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG). As he said, I did spend a year in Alaska; and it was a wonderful time.

But as a part of spending that year in Alaska, Mr. Chairman, I learned a lot about fish and wildlife and misappropriations of funds. It appalls me the way that fishermen and hunters pay willingly, in fact eagerly, excise taxes on hunting and fishing equipment in order to preserve and to provide conservation programs for fish and game, nongame species, for badly needed habitat.

But having said all this, I find, after being in Washington for a short time, that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service takes sometimes, it seems to me, pride in misusing these funds; using them on projects that were never intended, using them on junkets, traveling around the world, not supporting habitat and wildlife and hunters and fishermen, but doing things that bear no resemblance to what this bill has been asked to do.

So I rise in strong support of the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. Young) and other supporters of this bill to lend my voice, because sportsmen in America are and always have been the original environmentalists.

When we talk about clean air, when we talk about clean water, there have never been people who are more concerned and who have a more common sense approach to maintaining the beauty and the natural wonder of our habitat and our wildlife than sportsmen.

So again, I applaud the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. Young) for bringing to the attention not only of sportsmen, but the American people, how their money has been misspent, even on antihunting programs, turning the Fish and Wildlife Service into an extension of the endangered species service, turning this into an environmental organization.

Again, let me reemphasize, the environment is something about which I and any sportsman cares very deeply about. But to use this money in ways other than the enhancement and the protection and the future of our wildlife and habitat is simply wrong, it is unacceptable. We want to be fiscally responsible. We have collected this money. We have the trust of our constituents when we collect Pittman-Robertson money, and it is up to us to make sure that that money is spent to preserve habitat, to protect wildlife and to create opportunities for present and future generations to enjoy the out of doors.

So again, let me lend my strongest and most enthusiastic support to the gentleman's efforts and commend this bill to my colleagues, and I ask for their support.

I am proud of my colleague, Chairman YOUNG and his staff for protecting our sportsmen and women around the country, and preserving the original purposes for which Pittman-Robertson and Dingell Johnson were enacted.

In 1937, a federal-state government cooperative program was begun for wildlife restoration. Monies are collected by the federal government from excises imposed on firearms, ammunition, and bows and arrows.

These taxes are returned to the states and territories for wildlife restoration or hunter safety and education programs.

Sportsmen are a unique group of people. How many people would voluntarily support and additional tax on themselves and send their money to Washington. On this side of the aisle were fighting everyday to help trim down the size of government and reduce our constituents taxes. I have not heard from one sportsman from my district to eliminate this excise tax. I have however heard from sportsmen to return this program back to its original intent.

Sportsman support this program—or the intent of this program because—they are the true environmentalist. They want to preserve as wild life and natural habitats.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife has over stepped there bounds in administrating these funds. This legislation seeks to fix the loopholes that

the Fish and Wildlife Service uses to justify the frivolous expenditures to quote/unquote administer this trust funds. I certainly understand and support the staff that helps distribute these funds back to our states, but the flagrant abuses and mismanagement of these funds has caused Congress to help U.S. Fish and Wildlife—follow the intent of the original Act.

This bill will streamline the use of the administration funds and define the how they can be used. This bill reduces bureaucracy in the U.S. Fish and Wildlife, increases accountability, and puts our conservation dollars into conservation projects back home. I would ask that my colleagues support Mr. YOUNG's bill and his amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to close.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as we finish this debate, I would hope that we would be able to hold this in perspective, because I do not think that this bill is finished yet; I think, in fact, it is a work in progress. I hope that Members who are interested and concerned about this would just look at the letter from the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies who are expressing some of the very same concerns that I am expressing about the funding levels in this legislation. We agree, they agree, and almost everybody in this Chamber agrees that many of these reforms are fine and should be made. But, when we get done, we have to leave this agency in a position to properly deal with the charge that we have given them.

As for those who want to keep coming here and saying that they want to slaughter this agency because GAO said this is the worst managed program they have ever seen, I think maybe that statement in and of itself would call into question the GAO audit. I wonder if the GAO ever took a look at the oil shale program. I bet that was a beaut. That was billions of dollars. Or, how about that coal fusion program where we were spending that money, those guys out in Utah still trying to bring it in on time. How about the uranium reprocessing program, the space station, the big dig going on up there in Boston, the Resolution Trust Corporation. Now, there is one that cost us hundreds of billions of dollars. This was the worst managed program these GAO auditors ever saw?

I have to tell my colleagues that these GAO auditors maybe just did not have the right experience, because as it turns out, as we reconcile all of the concerns that they raised and the issues that they raised, we are now down to about \$700,000 of seriously questioned expenses that should not have been allowed.

So to suggest that somehow this agency has run amok, and I find it interesting that as we say that, we are now giving this agency in this legislation the exact duties that supposedly we criticized them for, but we know are

essential and must be done if, in fact, the State programs are going to work.

□ 1645

So this is not the worst. Tragically to say for the taxpayers of this country, this is not the worst program GAO has ever encountered. Maybe this GAO auditor, but he probably was not around for that C-121 when the wings broke off. That was a hell of a program we had going there.

How about that one where we sent subsidized water so people will grow more cotton, but we have a cotton retirement program, so we buy the cotton back from them? That is going on today. There is a good program.

How about those KV funds, where the Forest Service could not tell us where any of the funds were? We still do not know today. Fortunately, the Committee on Appropriations started to put a stop to that.

That mining law has worked out well for the taxpayers of this country. We have lost billions and billions of dollars.

This is not the worst program. This is a program that has gotten off track. This is a program that has abused, has abused the authority that is given to it. We ought to put it back in line. I think the Chairman's legislation goes a long way toward that.

I still want to say that we have to leave this agency there, because those same sportsmen, hunters and fisherpersons that like this program, that use this program, have seen it improve. Their experience out there in the countryside recognizes the need of this agency to get that done in cooperation with the States.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I do thank the gentleman from California for making my case. This is an agency that is off track. This is an agency, as I have said before, and I am not pointing fingers at any individual, that went from 2 percent to 14 percent. They spent money inappropriately. What we have to do is to gain the faith back from the sportsmen.

This is different than all the instances that the gentleman talked about the GAO investigating, the planes, et cetera. This is different. Every sportsman from 1937 took their money voluntarily and contributed 11 percent of the cost of that product to go into a fund to be redistributed back to the States to keep up the projects for fishing and hunting and other activities on our lands. That is what it was for. They did that voluntarily.

What we found out as this investigation went forward, we were finding out disgruntled sportsmen deciding that maybe they ought not to pay the tax, maybe we ought not to go forward with the program.

What I am trying to do with this legislation is to make sure there will be

no money spent on things that were spent in the past such as travel, such as alcohol, such as things that the Congress would not appropriate money for, reestablishing the strength and trust of this trust fund.

In turn, as I have said before, if we adopt my amendment, they are at the same level that they said and required from me, \$19 million to manage the program. We will lose, after 1 year, ten employees because they are bloated right now. The second year we will lose 10 more. That is 20 total. Then it is based upon the cost index, and they can get more if there is more need, or in fact if there is not a need they will get less. We are not gutting this program. In fact, we are encouraging the program.

The sportsmen I have heard from support what we are trying to do under this legislation. I urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

Mr. Chairman. I include the following exchange of letters for the RECORD.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, April 3, 2000.

Hon. DON YOUNG,  
Chairman, Committee on Resources,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN YOUNG: I understand that on Thursday, March 30, 2000, the Committee on Resources reported H.R. 3671, the "Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000." As approved, the bill amends the Wildlife Restoration Act and Sport Fish Restoration Act programs and makes several changes relating to the expenditures of funds arising from dedicated excise taxes on recreational sporting and fishing equipment and supplies, generally.

As you know, each trust Fund in the Trust Fund Code includes specific provisions within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means which limit purposes for which trust fund monies may be spent. Statutorily, the Committee on Ways and Means generally has limited expenditures by cross-referencing provisions of authorizing legislation. Currently, with respect to the Aquatic Resources Trust Fund (the "Aquatic Fund"), the Trust Fund Code provisions approve all expenditures out of the Aquatic Fund permitted under authorization Acts, but only as those Acts were in effect on the date of enactment of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century. Further, if unauthorized expenditures are made, no further tax revenues will be deposited to the Trust Fund. Thus, an Act not referenced in the Trust Fund Code must be approved by the Committee on Ways and Means before the authorizations are funded.

I now understand that you are seeking to have the bill considered by the House as early as this week. In addition, I have been informed that your Committee will seek an amendment incorporating language which I am supplying (attached) to make the necessary Trust Fund Code amendments to allow the proposed expenditures to occur.

Based upon this understanding, and in order to expedite consideration of H.R. 3671, it will not be necessary for the Committee on Ways and Means to markup this legislation. This is being done with the further understanding that the Committee will be treated without prejudice as to its jurisdictional prerogatives on such or similar provisions in the future, and it should not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to the Committee on Ways and Means in the future.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 3671, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be placed in the Record during consideration of the bill on the Floor. Thank you for your cooperation and assistance on this matter.

With best personal regards,  
BILL ARCHER,  
Chairman.

Attachment.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3671, AS REPORTED  
OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

Page 28, after line 24, insert the following:  
SEC. . CONFORMING AMENDMENT.

Section 9504(b)(2)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking "(as in effect on the date of the enactment of the TEA 21 Restoration Act)" and inserting "(as in effect on the date of the enactment of the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000)".

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES,  
Washington, DC, April 3, 2000.

Hon. BILL ARCHER,  
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for your letter regarding an amendment to H.R. 3671, the Wildlife and Sportfish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000. I appreciate your cooperation in providing a cross-reference in the Internal Revenue Code to allow our amendments to the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act in H.R. 3671 to be executed and fully funded through the Aquatic Resources Trust Fund.

As you noted in your letter, I propose that this change be accomplished through a manager's amendment to H.R. 3671, which will be made in order by a rule for consideration of the bill. I concur that your acquiescence to this amendment not be considered prejudicial to your jurisdiction over this or any similar measure in the future, nor would it be considered as precedent for any future changes in trust fund accounts.

Thank you again for your timely assistance in moving H.R. 3671 to the Floor. Enactment of H.R. 3671 will ensure that the taxes paid by sportsmen and women will be used appropriately for fish and wildlife conservation projects with minimal administrative expenditures.

Sincerely,  
DON YOUNG,  
Chairman.

Mr. WU. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3671, the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000. This common sense bill will prevent dollars paid by sportsmen and sportswomen from being spent in ways that do not help wildlife, sport fish and related restoration efforts, and it will send more money to the states for them to use for conservation projects.

Currently, Oregon receives a little over \$4.6 million under the Pittman-Robertson Act, and just under \$5.5 million under the Dingell-Johnson Act. These dollars go to support important programs such as stocking fish, improving habitat, resource education, fisheries research for sports-fishing and building boat ramps and infrastructure to support the sports fishing industry. As an avid hunter and fisherman, I strongly support these two programs.

My colleagues on the Resources Committee held several hearings on these bills. Unfortunately, it was revealed through the hearings

that the funds withheld by the Fish and Wildlife Service to administer and execute the Pittman-Robertson and Dingell-Johnson Acts were used to fund unrelated expenses.

In addition, funds that were used for true administration of these programs were not used responsibly. I commend the committee for working with the Fish and Wildlife Service in coming to a bipartisan, common sense solution that uses more dollars for fish and wildlife and less on administration.

Mr. Chairman, programs that assist recreation and conservation are good for Oregon and good for the United States. Doing this in a way that decreases waste is even better. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting in favor of H.R. 3671.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill is considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and is considered as read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 3671

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000".

#### SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **WILDLIFE RESTORATION ACT.**—The term "Wildlife Restoration Act" means the Act of September 2, 1937 (chapter 899; 16 U.S.C. 669 et seq.), popularly known as the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act and as the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act.

(2) **SPORT FISH RESTORATION ACT.**—The term "Sport Fish Restoration Act" means the Act of August 9, 1950 (chapter 658; 16 U.S.C. 777 et seq.), popularly known as the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act and as the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act.

#### TITLE I—WILDLIFE RESTORATION

##### SEC. 101. EXPENDITURES FOR ADMINISTRATION.

(a) **ANNUAL SET-ASIDE FOR ADMINISTRATION.**—Section 4 of the Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669c) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c);

(2) by amending so much as precedes the second sentence of subsection (a) to read as follows:

"ALLOCATION AND APPORTIONMENT OF AVAILABLE AMOUNTS

"SEC. 4. (a) **SET-ASIDE FOR ADMINISTRATION.**—(1) Of the revenues (excluding interest accruing under section 3(b)) covered into the fund in each fiscal year, up to \$5,000,000 may be used by the Secretary for expenses to administer this Act, in accordance with this subsection and section 9 in each of the fiscal years 2001, 2002, and 2003. Of the revenues (excluding interest accruing under section 3(b)) covered into the fund in each fiscal year, beginning in fiscal year 2004, such amount, adjusted annually to reflect the changes in the Consumer Price Index, not to exceed \$7,000,000, may be used by the Secretary for expenses to administer this Act, in accordance with this subsection and section 9.

"(2)(A) The amount authorized to be used by the Secretary under paragraph (1) each fiscal year shall remain available for obligation for such use until the expiration of that fiscal year. Within 60 days after that fiscal year, the Sec-

retary shall apportion among the States any of the amount that remains unobligated at the end of the fiscal year, on the same basis and in the same manner as other amounts authorized by this Act are apportioned among the States for the fiscal year in which the apportionment is made.

"(B) Within 30 days after the end of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall—

"(i) certify in writing to the Secretary of the Treasury and to each State fish and game department—

"(I) the amount apportioned under subparagraph (A) to each State in the most recent apportionment under that subparagraph; and

"(II) amounts obligated by the Secretary during the fiscal year for administration of this Act; and

"(ii) publish in the Federal Register the amounts so certified.

"(b) **APPORTIONMENT TO STATES.**—"; and

(3) in subsection (b), as designated by the amendment made by paragraph (2), by striking "after making the aforesaid deduction, shall apportion, except as provided in subsection (b) of this section," and inserting "after deducting the amount authorized to be used under subsection (a), the amount apportioned under subsection (c), any amount apportioned under section 8A, and amounts provided as grants under sections 10 and 11, shall apportion".

(b) **REQUIREMENTS AND RESTRICTIONS REGARDING USE OF AMOUNTS FOR ADMINISTRATION.**—Section 9 of the Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669h) is amended to read as follows:

"REQUIREMENTS AND RESTRICTIONS REGARDING USE OF AMOUNTS FOR ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 9. (a) **AUTHORIZED ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.**—The Secretary may use amounts under section 4(a)(1) only for administration expenses that directly support the implementation of this Act and that consist of any of the following:

"(1) Personnel costs of any employee who directly administers this Act on a full-time basis.

"(2) Personnel costs of any employee who directly administers this Act on a part-time basis for at least 20 hours each week, not to exceed the portion of such costs incurred with respect to the work hours of such employee during which the employee directly administers this Act, as such hours are certified by the supervisor of the employee.

"(3) Support costs directly associated with personnel costs authorized under paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection not including costs associated with staffing and operation of regional offices of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the Department of the Interior, other than for purposes of this Act.

"(4) Costs to evaluate, approve, disapprove, and advise concerning comprehensive fish and wildlife resource management plans under section 6(a)(1) and wildlife restoration projects under section 6(a)(2).

"(5) Overhead costs, including general administrative services, that are directly attributable to administration of this Act based on—

"(A) actual costs, as determined by a direct cost allocation methodology approved by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget for use by Federal agencies; and

"(B) for those costs not determinable pursuant to subparagraph (A), an amount per full-time equivalent employee authorized pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2) that does not exceed the amount charged or assessed for such costs per full-time equivalent employee for any other division or program of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

"(6) Costs incurred in auditing the wildlife and sportfish activities of each State fish and game department and the use of funds under section 6 by each State fish and game department every 5 years.

"(7) Costs of audits under subsection (d).

"(8) Costs of necessary training of Federal and State full-time personnel who administer this Act to improve administration of this Act.

"(9) Costs of travel to the States, territories, and Canada by personnel who administer this Act on a full-time basis for purposes directly related to administration of State programs or projects, or who administer grants under section 6, section 10, or section 11.

"(10) Costs of travel outside of the United States (except travel to Canada) that relates directly to administration of this Act and that is approved directly by the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks.

"(11) Relocation expenses for personnel who, after relocation, will administer this Act on a full-time basis for at least 1 year, as certified by the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service at the time such relocation expenses are incurred.

"(12) Costs to audit, evaluate, approve, disapprove, and advise concerning grants under section 6, section 10, or section 11.

"(b) **UNAUTHORIZED COSTS.**—Use of funds for a cost to administer this Act shall not be authorized because the cost is not expressly prohibited by this Act.

"(c) **RESTRICTION ON USE TO SUPPLEMENT GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS.**—The Secretary may not use amounts under section 4(a)(1) to supplement any function for which general appropriations are made for the United States Fish and Wildlife Service or any other entity of the Department of the Interior.

"(d) **AUDIT REQUIREMENT.**—(1) The Inspector General of the Department of the Interior shall procure the conduct of biennial audits, in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles, of expenditures of amounts used by the Secretary for administration of this Act.

"(2) Audits under this subsection shall be performed under contracts that are awarded under competitive procedures (as that term is defined in section 4 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403)), by a person that is not associated in any way with the Department of the Interior.

"(3) The auditor selected pursuant to paragraph (1) shall report to, and be supervised by, the Inspector General of the Department of the Interior, except that the auditor shall submit a copy of the biennial audit findings to the Secretary at the time such findings are submitted to the Inspector General of the Department of the Interior.

"(4) The Inspector General of the Department of the Interior shall promptly report to the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate on the results of each such audit.

"(e) **CERTIFICATION BY SECRETARY.**—(1) The Secretary shall within 3 months after each fiscal year certify in writing to the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate the following for the fiscal year:

"(A) The amount of funds used under section 4(a)(1) and a breakdown of categories for which such funds were expended.

"(B) The amount of funds apportioned to States under section 4(a)(2).

"(C) The results of the audits performed pursuant to subsection (d).

"(D) That all funds expended under section 4(a)(1) were necessary for administration of this Act.

"(E) The Secretary, the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Assistant Director for Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs each properly discharged their duties under this Act.

"(2) The Secretary may not delegate the responsibility to make certifications under paragraph (1) except to the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks.

"(3) Within 60 days after the start of each fiscal year, the Assistant Director for Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs shall provide to the Committee on Resources of the House of

Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate the following for the fiscal year:

“(A) The amount of funds that will be expended in the fiscal year under section 4(a)(1) and a breakdown of categories for which such funds will be expended.

“(B) A description of how the funds to be expended are necessary for administration of this Act.

“(4) The Secretary shall promptly publish in the Federal Register each certification under this subsection.

“(f) CERTIFICATION BY ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR WILDLIFE AND SPORT FISH RESTORATION PROGRAMS.—Within 1 month after the end of each fiscal year, the Assistant Director for Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs shall—

“(1) certify that—

“(A) all amounts expended in that fiscal year to administer this Act in agency headquarters and in regional offices of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service were used in accordance with this Act; and

“(B) all such expenditures were necessary to administer this Act; and

“(2) distribute such certifications to each State fish and game department.”.

#### SEC. 102. FIREARM AND BOW HUNTER EDUCATION AND SAFETY PROGRAM GRANTS.

The Wildlife Restoration Act is amended by redesignating section 10 as section 12, and by inserting after section 9 the following:

“FIREARM AND BOW HUNTER EDUCATION AND SAFETY PROGRAM GRANTS

“SEC. 10. (a) IN GENERAL.—Of the revenues covered into the fund in each fiscal year, \$15,000,000, less the amount used under section 4(a) and the amount granted under section 11(a)(1), shall be apportioned among the States in the manner specified in section 4(b) by the Secretary for the following:

“(1) Grants to States for the enhancement of hunter education programs, hunter and sporting firearm safety programs, and hunter development programs.

“(2) Grants for the enhancement of interstate coordination and development of hunter education programs.

“(3) Grants to States for the enhancement of bow hunter and archery education, safety, and development programs.

“(4) Grants to States for the enhancement of construction or enhancement of firearm shooting ranges and archery ranges, and updating safety features of firearm shooting ranges and archery ranges.

“(b) COST-SHARING.—The Federal share of the cost of any activity carried out with a grant under this section may not exceed 75 percent of the total cost of the activity and the remainder of the cost shall come from a non-Federal source.

“(c) PERIOD OF AVAILABILITY; REAPPORTIONMENT.—Amounts available under this subsection shall remain available for 1 fiscal year, after which all unobligated balances shall be apportioned among the States in the manner specified in section 4(b).”.

#### SEC. 103. MULTI-STATE CONSERVATION GRANT PROGRAM.

The Wildlife Restoration Act is further amended by inserting after section 10 the following:

“MULTI-STATE CONSERVATION GRANT PROGRAM

“SEC. 11. (a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Up to \$2,500,000 of the revenues covered into the fund each fiscal year shall be available to the Secretary for making multi-State conservation grants in accordance with this section.

“(2) Amounts available under this subsection shall remain available for two fiscal years, after which all unobligated balances shall be apportioned in the manner specified in section 4(b).

“(b) SELECTION OF PROJECTS.—(1) A project shall not be eligible for a grant under this sec-

tion unless it will benefit at least 26 States, a majority of the States in a region of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, or a regional association of State fish and game departments.

“(2) The Secretary may award grants under this section based only on a priority list of wildlife restoration projects prepared and submitted by State fish and game departments acting through the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies each fiscal year in accordance with paragraph (3).

“(3)(A) The International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies shall—

“(i) prepare each priority list through a committee comprised of the heads of State fish and game departments (or their designees);

“(ii) approve each priority list by a majority of the heads of all State fish and game departments (or their designees); and

“(iii) submit each priority list by not later than October 1 of each fiscal year to the Assistant Director for Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs, who shall accept such list on behalf of the Secretary.

“(B) In preparing any priority list under this paragraph, the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies shall consult with nongovernmental organizations that represent conservation organizations, sportsmen organizations, and industries that support or promote hunting, trapping, recreational shooting, bow hunting, or archery.

“(4) The Assistant Director for Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs shall publish in the Federal Register each priority list submitted under this subsection.

“(c) ELIGIBLE GRANTEEES.—(1) The Secretary may make a grant under this section only to—

“(A) a State or group of States; or

“(B) subject to paragraph (2), a nongovernmental organization.

“(2) Any nongovernmental organization applying for a grant under this section shall submit with the application to the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies a certification that the organization does not promote or encourage opposition to regulated hunting or trapping of regulated wildlife, and will use any funds awarded pursuant to this section in compliance with subsection (d).

“(3) Any nongovernmental organization that is found to promote or encourage opposition to regulated hunting or trapping of regulated wildlife or does not use funds in compliance with subsection (d) shall return all funds received and be subject to any other penalties under law.

“(d) USE OF GRANTS.—Amounts provided as a grant under this section may not be used for education, activities, projects, or programs that promote or encourage opposition to regulated hunting or trapping of regulated wildlife.

“(e) CLARIFICATION.—No activities undertaken by the personnel of State fish and game departments under this section shall constitute advice or recommendations for 1 or more agencies or officers of the Federal Government.”.

#### SEC. 104. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.

Section 5 of the Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669d) is amended by inserting “, at the time such deduction or apportionment is made” after “he has apportioned to each State”.

#### TITLE II—SPORT FISH RESTORATION

##### SEC. 201. EXPENDITURES FOR ADMINISTRATION.

(a) ANNUAL SET-ASIDE FOR ADMINISTRATION.—Section 4(d) of the Sport Fish Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 777c(d)) is amended to read as follows:

“(d)(1) Of the balance of each such annual appropriation remaining after the distribution and use under subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section and section 14, up to \$5,000,000 may be used by the Secretary of the Interior for expenses in accordance with this subsection and section 9 in each of the fiscal years 2001, 2002, and 2003. Of the balance of each such annual appropriation remaining after the distribution and use under subsections (a), (b), and (c) of

this section and section 14, beginning in fiscal year 2004, such amount, adjusted annually to reflect the changes in the Consumer Price Index, not to exceed \$7,000,000, may be used by the Secretary of the Interior for expenses in accordance with this subsection and section 9.

“(2) The amount authorized to be used by the Secretary under paragraph (1) each fiscal year shall remain available for obligation for such use until the expiration of that fiscal year. Within 60 days after the end of that fiscal year, the Secretary shall apportion any of the amount that remains unobligated at the end of the fiscal year on the same basis and in the same manner as other amounts authorized by this Act are apportioned among the States under section 4(e) for the fiscal year in which the apportionment is made.”.

(b) REQUIREMENTS AND RESTRICTIONS REGARDING USE OF AMOUNTS FOR ADMINISTRATION.—Section 9 of the Sport Fish Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 777h) is amended to read as follows:

“REQUIREMENTS AND RESTRICTIONS REGARDING USE OF AMOUNTS FOR ADMINISTRATION

“SEC. 9. (a) AUTHORIZED ADMINISTRATION COSTS.—The Secretary of the Interior may use amounts under section 4(d) only for administration expenses that directly support the implementation of this Act and that consist of any of the following:

“(1) Personnel costs of any employee who directly administers this Act on a full-time basis.

“(2) Personnel costs of any employee who directly administers this Act on a part-time basis for at least 20 hours each week, not to exceed the portion of such costs incurred with respect to the work hours of such employee during which the employee directly administers this Act, as such hours are certified by the supervisor of the employee.

“(3) Support costs directly associated with personnel costs authorized under paragraphs (1) and (2).

“(4) Costs to evaluate, approve, disapprove, and advise concerning comprehensive fish and wildlife resource management plans under section 6(a)(1) and fish restoration and management projects under section 6(a)(2).

“(5) Overhead costs, including general administrative services, that are directly attributable to administration of this Act based on—

“(A) actual costs, as determined by a direct cost allocation methodology approved by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget for use by Federal agencies; and

“(B) for those costs not determinable pursuant to subparagraph (A), an amount per full-time equivalent employee authorized pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2) that does not exceed the amount charged or assessed for such costs per full-time equivalent employee for any other division or program of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

“(6) Costs incurred in auditing the wildlife and sport fish activities of each State fish and game department and the use of funds under section 6 by each State fish and game department every 5 years.

“(7) Costs of audits under subsection (d).

“(8) Costs of necessary training of Federal and State full-time personnel who administer this Act to improve administration of this Act.

“(9) Costs of travel to the States, territories, and Canada by personnel who administer this Act on a full-time basis for purposes directly related to administration of State programs or projects, or who administer grants under section 6 or section 14.

“(10) Costs of travel outside of the United States (except travel to Canada) that relates to administration of this Act and that is approved directly by the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks.

“(11) Relocation expenses for personnel who, after relocation, will administer this Act on a full-time basis for at least 1 year, as certified by the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service at the time such relocation expenses are incurred.

“(12) Costs to audit, evaluate, approve, disapprove, and advise concerning grants under section 6 and section 14.

“(b) UNAUTHORIZED COSTS.—Use of funds for a cost to administer this Act shall not be authorized because the cost is not expressly prohibited by this Act.

“(c) RESTRICTION ON USE TO SUPPLEMENT GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS.—The Secretary may not use amounts under section 4(d) to supplement any function for which general appropriations are made for the United States Fish and Wildlife Service or any other entity of the Department of the Interior.

“(d) AUDIT REQUIREMENT.—(1) The Inspector General of the Department of the Interior shall procure the conduct of biennial audits, in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles, of expenditures of amounts used by the Secretary for administration of this Act.

“(2) Audits under this subsection shall be performed under contracts that are awarded under competitive procedures (as that term is defined in section 4 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403)), by a person that is not associated in any way with the Department of the Interior.

“(3) The auditor selected pursuant to paragraph (1) shall report to, and be supervised by, the Inspector General of the Department of the Interior, except that the auditor shall submit a copy of the biennial audit findings to the Secretary of the Interior at the time such findings are submitted to the Inspector General of the Department of the Interior.

“(4) The Inspector General of the Department of the Interior shall promptly report to the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate on the results of each such audit.

“(e) CERTIFICATION BY SECRETARY.—(1) The Secretary of the Interior shall within 3 months after each fiscal year certify in writing to the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate the following for the fiscal year:

“(A) The amount of funds used under section 4(d) and a breakdown of categories for which such funds were expended.

“(B) The amount of funds apportioned to States under section 4(d)(2)(A).

“(C) The results of the audits performed pursuant to subsection (d).

“(D) That all funds expended under section 4(d) were necessary for administration of this Act.

“(E) The Secretary, Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Assistant Director for Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs each properly discharged their duties under this Act.

“(2) The Secretary may not delegate the responsibility to make certifications under paragraph (1) except to the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks.

“(3) The Secretary shall promptly publish in the Federal Register each certification under this subsection.

“(f) CERTIFICATION BY ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR WILDLIFE AND SPORT FISH RESTORATION PROGRAMS.—Within 1 month after the end of each fiscal year, the Assistant Director for Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs shall—

“(1) certify that—

“(A) all amounts expended in that fiscal year to administer this Act in agency headquarters and in regional offices of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service were used in accordance with this Act; and

“(B) all such expenditures were necessary to administer this Act; and

“(2) distribute such certifications to each State fish and game department.”.

#### SEC. 202. MULTI-STATE GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—The Sport Fish Restoration Act is amended by striking the

second section 13 (16 U.S.C. 777 note) and inserting the following:

#### “MULTI-STATE CONSERVATION GRANT PROGRAM

“SEC. 14. (a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Of the balance of each annual appropriation made in accordance with section 3 remaining after the distribution and use under subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 4 each fiscal year, up to \$2,500,000 shall be available to the Secretary of the Interior for making multi-State conservation grants in accordance with this section.

“(2) Amounts available under this subsection shall remain available for 2 fiscal years, after which all unobligated balances shall be apportioned in the manner specified in section 4(e).

“(b) SELECTION OF PROJECTS.—(1) A project shall not be eligible for a grant under this section unless it will benefit at least 26 States, a majority of the States in a region of the Fish and Wildlife Service, or a regional association of State fish and game departments.

“(2) The Secretary of the Interior may award grants under this section based only on a priority list of sportfish restoration projects prepared and submitted by State fish and game departments acting through the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies each fiscal year in accordance with paragraph (3).

“(3)(A) The International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies shall—

“(i) prepare each priority list through a committee comprised of the heads of State fish and game departments (or their designees);

“(ii) approve each priority list by a majority of the heads of State fish and game departments (or their designees); and

“(iii) submit each priority list by not later than October 1 of each fiscal year to the Secretary of the Interior.

“(B) In preparing any priority list under this paragraph, the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies shall consult with nongovernmental organizations that represent conservation organizations, sportsmen organizations, and industries that fund the Sport Fish Restoration Programs.

“(4) The Assistant Director for Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs shall publish in the Federal Register each priority list submitted under this subsection.

“(c) ELIGIBLE GRANTEES.—(1) The Secretary of the Interior may make a grant under this section only to—

“(A) a State or group of States; or

“(B) subject to paragraph (2) a nongovernmental organization.

“(2) Any nongovernmental organization applying for a grant under this section shall submit with the application to the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies a certification that the organization does not promote or encourage opposition to the regulated taking of fish and will use any funds awarded pursuant to this section in compliance with subsection (d).

“(3) Any nongovernmental organization that is found to promote or encourage opposition to the regulated taking of fish or does not use funds in compliance with subsection (d) shall return all funds received and be subject to any other penalties under law.

“(d) USE OF GRANTS.—Amounts provided as a grant under this section may not be used for education, activities, projects, or programs that promote or encourage opposition to the regulated taking of fish.

“(e) CLARIFICATION.—No activities undertaken by the personnel of State fish and game departments, other State agencies, or organizations of State fish and game departments under this section shall constitute advice or recommendations for 1 or more agencies or officers of the Federal Government.

“(f) FUNDING FOR MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSIONS.—Of the balance of each annual appropriation made in accordance with section 3 remaining after the distribution and use under

subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 4 each fiscal year and after deducting amounts used for grants under subsection (a) of this section, \$200,000 shall be available for each of—

“(1) the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission;

“(2) the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission;

“(3) the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission; and

“(4) the Great Lakes Fisheries Commission.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 4 of the Sport Fish Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 777c) is amended in subsection (e) by inserting “of this section and section 14” after “subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d)”.

#### SEC. 203. CERTIFICATIONS.

Section 5 of the Sport Fish Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 777d) is amended—

(1) by striking “SEC. 5.” and inserting the following:

#### “CERTIFICATIONS

“SEC. 5. (a) ADMINISTRATIVE DEDUCTION AND STATE APPORTIONMENTS.—”;

(2) in subsection (a) (as designated by the amendment made by paragraph (1) of this section) by inserting “, at the time such deduction or apportionment is made” after “apportioned to each State for such fiscal year”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) FISCAL YEAREND CERTIFICATION BY SECRETARY.—Within 30 days after the end of each fiscal year, the Secretary of the Interior shall—

“(1) certify in writing to the Secretary of the Treasury and to each State fish and game department—

“(A) the amount apportioned under section 4(d)(2) to each State in the most recent apportionment under that section for that fiscal year; and

“(B) amounts obligated by the Secretary during the fiscal year for administration of this Act; and

“(2) publish in the Federal Register the amounts so certified.

“(c) CERTIFICATION BY ASSISTANT DIRECTOR.—

(1) Within 60 days after the start of each fiscal year, the Assistant Director for Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs shall provide to the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate the following for the fiscal year:

“(A) The amount of funds that will be expended in the fiscal year under section 4(d)(2) and a breakdown of categories for which such funds will be expended.

“(B) A description of how the funds to be expended are necessary for administration of this Act.

“(2) The Secretary of the Interior shall promptly publish in the Federal Register each certification under this subsection.”.

#### SEC. 204. PERIOD OF AVAILABILITY.

Section 4(f) of the Sport Fish Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 777c) is amended by striking the first sentence.

### TITLE III—WILDLIFE AND SPORT FISH RESTORATION PROGRAMS

#### SEC. 301. DESIGNATION OF PROGRAMS.

The programs established under the Wildlife Restoration Act and the Sport Fish Restoration Act may be collectively referred to as the Federal Assistance Program for State Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs.

#### SEC. 302. ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR WILDLIFE AND SPORT FISH RESTORATION PROGRAMS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established within the United States Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior an Assistant Director for Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs.

(b) SUPERIOR.—The Assistant Director for Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs shall report directly to the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

(c) **RESPONSIBILITIES.**—*The Assistant Director for Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs shall be responsible for the administration, management, and oversight of the Federal Assistance Program for State Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs under the Wildlife Restoration Act and the Sport Fish Restoration Act.*

**SEC. 303. CHIEF OF THE DIVISION OF FEDERAL AID.**

*The Chief of the Division of Federal Aid of the Department of the Interior, or any similar position, is abolished and the duties of that position shall be the responsibility of the Assistant Director for Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs.*

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment printed in House Report 106-558 shall be considered as read and shall not be subject to amendment or to a demand for division of the question.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered as read.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment, and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

Are there amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 106-558 offered by Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

Page 3, strike line 19 and all that follows through page 4, line 5, and insert the following:

"SEC. 4. (a) SET-ASIDE FOR ADMINISTRATION.—(1)(A) Of the revenues (excluding interest accruing under section 3(b)) covered into the fund, the Secretary may use up to the amount specified in subparagraph (B) for expenses to administer this Act, in accordance with this subsection and section 9.

"(B) The amount referred to in subparagraph (A) is the following:

"(i) In fiscal year 2001, \$7,090,000.

"(ii) In fiscal year 2002, \$6,710,000.

"(iii) In fiscal year 2003, \$6,330,000.

"(iv) In fiscal year 2004 and each fiscal year thereafter—

"(I) the amount available for the preceding fiscal year, plus

"(II) an amount to reflect the change in the consumer price index over the preceding fiscal year, which shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury by multiplying such change times the amount available for the preceding fiscal year.

Page 16, strike line 18 and all that follows through page 17, line 5, and insert the following:

"(d)(1)(A) Of the balance of each such annual appropriation remaining after the distribution and use under subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section and section 14, the Secretary of the Interior may use up to the amount specified in subparagraph (B) for expenses to administer this Act, in accordance with this subsection and section 9.

"(B) The amount referred to in subparagraph (A) is the following:

"(i) In fiscal year 2001, \$7,090,000.

"(ii) In fiscal year 2002, \$6,710,000.

"(iii) In fiscal year 2003, \$6,330,000.

"(iv) In fiscal year 2004 and each fiscal year thereafter—

"(I) the amount available for the preceding fiscal year, plus

"(II) an amount to reflect the change in the consumer price index over the preceding fiscal year, which shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury by multiplying such change times the amount available for the preceding fiscal year.

Page 6, strike lines 16 through 19 and insert the following:

"(4) Costs of determining under section 6(a) whether State comprehensive plans and projects are substantial in character and design.

Page 12, line 19, after "education" insert "and shooting range".

Page 12, line 25, strike "enhancement" and insert "development".

Page 15, line 16, strike "regulated".

Page 15, line 20, strike "regulated".

Page 18, strike lines 12 through 16 and insert the following:

"(4) Costs of determining under section 6(a) whether State comprehensive plans and projects are substantial in character and design.

Page 28, after line 24, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**

Section 9504(b)(2)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking "(as in effect on the date of the enactment of the TEA 21 Restoration Act)" and inserting "(as in effect on the date of the enactment of the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000)".

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment which increases the funding levels in the bill from \$10 million to \$14 million for true administration expenses, but also assumes a transition period that reduces the number of program administrators from 120 to 100 over a period of 3 years, and then it adjusts upward thereafter based on the Consumer Price Index.

This amendment makes other technical changes to make sure the bill conforms with the Pittman-Robertson Dingell-Johnson Acts that we are not omitting at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest respectfully that this should answer the concerns of the gentleman from California about not having enough money. It raises the expenses, at least \$5 million more. That is \$19 million total. In 3 years, we drop the participation of the administrators from 120 to 100. Then if they need more after that, it will ratchet back up if necessary.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I raise the questions I raised earlier about those amendments, whether or not this goes far enough. I appreciate that the gentleman has added some money back. As I understand it, the \$5 million is money that will go directly to the States as part of the national program, so I think where we are left is about \$14 million for administration.

As I read the letters, again, from the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies and the National Wildlife Federation, again, who are strong supporters of this legislation and of the program, they indicate that they think that the figure is somewhat higher than that.

Originally we had talked about 18. That did not happen. They mentioned 16. Their formula figure may take it above that.

We are obviously not going to solve that issue here today, but I would hope that the gentleman would continue to consult with these supporters of the programs and certainly with the State wildlife agencies that are administering the State side of that program, because I think they do raise the concerns about that.

I do not know that exact figure yet, however. I believe it is higher than the figure the gentleman has in his budget. I would just hope that that could be done certainly before we contemplate sending this legislation to the White House.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Again if I can get the figures from the Fish and Wildlife directly, an explanation of what it is being spent for, I am willing to adjust these figures. This is the best we can do right now. I believe it is correct. We are not cutting back on the State administrators, other than 20. Then we will ratchet it back up over 3 year's time.

I think we are meeting most of those goals which the gentleman has raised in the point of order. We will go to the Senate. We will be talking.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, we have talked long, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and others who have been long involved in the program. We want to see this program come out whole at the end of this process with these changes and with this accountability. That is very important, I think, to all of our constituents.

I am not happy raising these issues, but I think they have to be raised so that we can arrive at a point where we are comfortable and we can tell the State agencies and the other organizations that work with them in cooperation that we have made this program whole and it is doing the things for which it was designed and which are appropriate for it to do.

I raise this at this time in conjunction with the manager's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there additional Members to speak on this amendment?

If not, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there additional amendments?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. UDALL OF COLORADO

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. UDALL of Colorado:

Page 30, after line 6 insert the following:

**SEC. 304. IMPLEMENTATION REPORT.**

(a) **TIMING.**—At the time the President submits a budget request for the Department of the Interior for the third fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall inform the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate about the steps taken to comply with this Act.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—The report required by this section shall indicate—

(1) the extent to which compliance with this Act has required a reduction in the number of personnel assigned to administer, manage, and oversee the Federal Assistance Program for State Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs;

(2) any revisions to this Act that would be desirable in order for the Secretary to adequately administer such programs and assure that funds provided to state agencies are properly used; and

(3) any other information regarding the implementation of this Act that the Secretary considers appropriate.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I will make a brief statement about the amendment.

The amendment is very simple. It would require the Secretary of the Interior to inform the Committee on Resources and the corresponding committee of the other body about administrative changes required by this bill.

In particular, it would require the Secretary to tell us about any reduction in the number of people assigned, to make sure that these important programs are being properly administered.

As I mentioned when the Committee on Resources considered the bill, these programs are very important for Colorado and all the other 49 States and territories. The assistance they can provide can help us greatly as we work to respond to the pressures on our fish and wildlife populations and the habitat that are coming under increasingly rapid population stresses and the resulting growth and sprawl.

The programs cannot be properly administered without adequate personnel and other resources, however. So I take seriously the concerns expressed by the Wildlife Management Institute, the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, and others who tell us that they fear that the bill's current limits threaten to undermine the ability of the Department of the Interior to properly manage the programs.

This amendment itself would not revise the bill's limits on administrative

expenses, but it would require the Department of the Interior to inform the committee and the Congress about how those limits affect the implementation of these important programs.

With that information, the committee in the future can consider whether or not to propose changes to that part of the bill.

I think the amendment does not detract from the purpose of the bill. It merely provides for our obtaining information for consideration as the committee carries out its future oversight and review responsibilities.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment provides a transition period to scale the program back slightly, making it more effective. We keep the level of current employees, 120, constant for the first year, and have a gradual reduction in the years following.

If the gentleman has modified his amendment by changing the word "first" to "third," which would allow the bill to take effect before the report is issued, then I would accept his amendment.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to modify the amendment to change "first" to "third." Whatever the chairman would like to do, I am with him.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I think everything is taken care of. We have all agreed.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment has already been modified at the desk. We are on the same page.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I apologize. I think the staff has told me that is settled.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would notify all Members that the modification was actually made to the amendment that was offered, so there is no need to modify based upon the conversation.

Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I really appreciate the leadership that has been shown on this very important bill, and the leadership and thoughtfulness that has gone into the amendment, because I do think that the committee does need to make sure that there is good oversight, because we had some very serious problems with the Pittman-Robertson administration of the funds.

I want to make it very, very clear, Mr. Chairman, that this legislation is very good, and it does not mean that we should stop pursuing violations that have occurred under current law. I think our investigation that was conducted in the committee clearly exposed the wrongs, and the wrongdoing must have consequences.

Mr. Chairman, what we have learned so far about this issue was disturbing, and this is the reason why we are on this House floor today, because millions of dollars specifically designated for the administration of the Federal Aid program established through the Pittman-Robinson Act and the Dingell-Johnson Act were diverted into a slush fund for the Secretary of the Interior.

The Secretary has subsequently divvied these monies out under a completely unauthorized Directors' Conservation Fund. Mr. Chairman, as we have broken these illegal expenditures down, the revelations about where these funds were spent really infuriated the sportsmen and really bothered taxpayers, who have generously contributed to this program. These funds are set aside by law to go towards State fish and game programs, but instead, the funds have gone toward Federal initiatives such as the spotted owl and the ferry shrimp and wolf reintroduction, the black-footed ferret, the American Rivers Conference, the Arctic Conference, and the grizzly bears that are attempted to be introduced into Idaho.

□ 1700

Moreover, the secretary did go ahead and use some of these funds for areas even completely unrelated to wildlife, such as NAFTA and Retirement Costs, the RAMSAR Convention and the Solicitor's Office.

Mr. Chairman, common sportsmen and women of this Nation were very disturbed to know that instead of going to the State to improve big game habitat nearly \$668,000 of their hard-earned dollars were being spent on about up to 140 Federal AID employees in the form of bonuses, as well as \$108,000 to personnel who do not even work for Federal AID, they were given awards.

These are the same Federal officials who in 1995 gave a mere \$89 of carried-over administrative funds back to the States while keeping over \$1 million for themselves.

This is a bipartisan effort, Mr. Speaker, and it is a bill very worthy of bipartisan support to correct some of the wrongs that have gone on in this particular fund. With the careful oversight of the committee in the future, I feel confident that it will be corrected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

At the end of the bill add the following new sections:

**SEC. . COMPLIANCE WITH BUY AMERICAN ACT**

No funds authorized pursuant to this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the assistance the entity will comply with sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a-10c, popularly known as the "Buy American Act").

# SEC. . SENSE OF CONGRESS; REQUIREMENT REGARDING NOTICE

(a) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—In the case of any equipment or products that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving such assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

(b) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance under this Act, the Secretary of Interior shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

# SEC. . PROHIBITION OF CONTRACTS.

If it has been finally determined by a court or Federal agency that any person intentionally affixed a label bearing a "Made in America" inscription, or any inscription with the same meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in the United States, such person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or subcontract made with funds provided pursuant to this Act, pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures described in section 9.400 through 9.409 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

Mr. TRAFICANT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to start out by commending the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) on a much-needed measure of reform. Congress was not designed to send signals. We do not work for the Western Union. Congress' role is to pass legislation, and the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the committee is doing the right thing.

I hope our great leader, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), will reconcile himself to that fact and in the final analysis work towards these goals.

I want to also pay a special tribute on behalf of all the sportsmen in America to the gentleman from Michigan, big JOHN DINGELL, the great job he has done and the fingerprints that he has over the years in this legislation now being modified by our chairman. I support the bill and I support these reforms.

My amendment deals with the money. They must comply with the Buy American Act, giving notice to the people who have given the money who has been wasting it. By the way, if they are going to continue to waste it, buy American made goods with it. I hope they do not waste it. There will be a notice given and if they do not comply with the act or place a fraudulent label on something that they purchase, they would be prohibited from engaging in business with the agencies herein affected and impacted by this legislation.

With that, I would ask the committee to accept this legislation.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot argue against the gentleman's comments and I would gladly accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other amendments?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THUNE) having assumed the Chair, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3671) to amend the Acts popularly known as the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act and the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act to enhance the funds available for grants to States for fish and wildlife conservation projects and increase opportunities for recreational hunting, bow hunting, trapping, archery, and fishing, by eliminating opportunities for waste, fraud, abuse, maladministration, and unauthorized expenditures for administration and execution of those Acts, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 455, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of substitute adopted in the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 423, nays 2, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 105]

YEAS—423

Abercrombie	Dickey	Johnson, Sam
Ackerman	Dicks	Jones (NC)
Aderholt	Dingell	Jones (OH)
Allen	Dixon	Kanjorski
Andrews	Doggett	Kaptur
Armey	Dooley	Kasich
Baca	Doolittle	Kelly
Bachus	Doyle	Kennedy
Baird	Dreier	Kildee
Baker	Duncan	Kilpatrick
Baldacci	Dunn	Kind (WI)
Baldwin	Edwards	King (NY)
Ballenger	Ehlers	Kingston
Barcia	Ehrlich	Klecza
Barr	Emerson	Klink
Barrett (NE)	Engel	Knollenberg
Barrett (WI)	English	Kolbe
Bartlett	Eshoo	Kucinich
Barton	Etheridge	Kuykendall
Bass	Evans	LaFalce
Bateman	Everett	LaHood
Becerra	Ewing	Lampson
Bentsen	Farr	Lantos
Bereuter	Fattah	Largent
Berkley	Filner	Larson
Berman	Fletcher	Latham
Berry	Foley	LaTourette
Biggert	Forbes	Lazio
Bilbray	Ford	Leach
Bilirakis	Fossella	Lee
Bishop	Fowler	Levin
Blagojevich	Frank (MA)	Lewis (CA)
Bliley	Franks (NJ)	Lewis (GA)
Blumenauer	Frelinghuysen	Lewis (KY)
Blunt	Frost	Linder
Boehlert	Galleghy	Lipinski
Boehner	Ganske	LoBiondo
Bonilla	Gejdenson	Lofgren
Bonior	Gekas	Lowe
Bono	Gephardt	Lucas (KY)
Borski	Gibbons	Lucas (OK)
Boswell	Gilchrest	Luther
Boucher	Gillmor	Maloney (CT)
Boyd	Gilman	Maloney (NY)
Brady (PA)	Gonzalez	Manzullo
Brady (TX)	Goode	Markey
Brown (FL)	Goodlatte	Martinez
Brown (OH)	Goodling	Mascara
Bryant	Gordon	Matsui
Burr	Goss	McCarthy (MO)
Burton	Graham	McCarthy (NY)
Buyer	Granger	McCollum
Callahan	Green (TX)	McCrery
Calvert	Green (WI)	McDermott
Camp	Greenwood	McGovern
Canady	Gutierrez	McHugh
Cannon	Gutknecht	McInnis
Capps	Hall (OH)	McIntosh
Capuano	Hall (TX)	McIntyre
Cardin	Hansen	McKeon
Carson	Hastings (FL)	McKinney
Castle	Hastings (WA)	McNulty
Chabot	Hayes	Meehan
Chambliss	Hayworth	Meek (FL)
Chenoweth-Hage	Hefley	Meeks (NY)
Clay	Herger	Menendez
Clayton	Hill (IN)	Metcalfe
Clyburn	Hill (MT)	Mica
Coble	Hilleary	Millender-
Coburn	Hilliard	McDonald
Collins	Hinchey	Miller (FL)
Combest	Hinojosa	Miller, Gary
Condit	Hobson	Miller, George
Conyers	Hoefel	Minge
Cooksey	Hoekstra	Mink
Costello	Holden	Moakley
Cox	Holt	Mollohan
Coyne	Hooley	Moore
Cramer	Horn	Moran (KS)
Crowley	Hostettler	Moran (VA)
Cubin	Houghton	Morella
Cummings	Hoyer	Murtha
Cunningham	Hulshof	Myrick
Danner	Hunter	Nadler
Davis (FL)	Hutchinson	Napolitano
Davis (IL)	Hyde	Neal
Davis (VA)	Inslee	Nethercutt
Deal	Isakson	Ney
DeFazio	Istook	Northup
DeGette	Jackson-Lee	Norwood
Delahunt	(TX)	Nussle
DeLauro	Jefferson	Oberstar
DeLay	Jenkins	Obey
DeMint	John	Olver
Deutsch	Johnson (CT)	Ortiz
Diaz-Balart	Johnson, E. B.	Ose

Owens	Salmon	Tanner
Oxley	Sanchez	Tauscher
Packard	Sanders	Tauzin
Pallone	Sandlin	Taylor (MS)
Pascarella	Sanford	Taylor (NC)
Pastor	Sawyer	Terry
Paul	Saxton	Thomas
Payne	Scarborough	Thompson (CA)
Pease	Schaffer	Thompson (MS)
Pelosi	Schakowsky	Thornberry
Peterson (MN)	Scott	Thune
Peterson (PA)	Sensenbrenner	Thurman
Petri	Serrano	Tiahrt
Phelps	Sessions	Tierney
Pickering	Shadegg	Toomey
Pickett	Shaw	Towns
Pitts	Shays	Trafficant
Pombo	Sherman	Turner
Pomeroy	Sherwood	Udall (CO)
Porter	Shimkus	Udall (NM)
Portman	Shows	Upton
Price (NC)	Shuster	Velazquez
Pryce (OH)	Simpson	Visclosky
Quinn	Sisisky	Vitter
Radanovich	Skeen	Walden
Rahall	Skelton	Walsh
Ramstad	Slaughter	Wamp
Regula	Smith (MI)	Watkins
Reyes	Smith (NJ)	Watt (NC)
Reynolds	Smith (TX)	Watts (OK)
Riley	Smith (WA)	Waxman
Rivers	Snyder	Weiner
Rodriguez	Souder	Weldon (FL)
Roemer	Spence	Weldon (PA)
Rogan	Spratt	Weller
Rogers	Stabenow	Wexler
Rohrabacher	Stark	Weygand
Ros-Lehtinen	Stearns	Whitfield
Rothman	Stenholm	Wicker
Roukema	Strickland	Wilson
Roybal-Allard	Stump	Wise
Royce	Stupak	Wolf
Rush	Sununu	Woolsey
Ryan (WI)	Sweeney	Wu
Ryun (KS)	Talent	Young (AK)
Sabo	Tancred	

## NAYS—2

Jackson (IL) Waters

## NOT VOTING—9

Archer	Cook	Vento
Campbell	Crane	Wynn
Clement	Rangel	Young (FL)

## □ 1727

Messrs. ENGEL, NADLER and HALL of Texas changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 3671.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THUNE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

# UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION BIENNIAL REPORT ON HAZARDOUS MATERIALS TRANSPORTATION CALENDAR YEARS 1996-1997—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United

States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure:

## To the Congress of the United States:

I herewith transmit the Department of Transportation's Biennial Report on Hazardous Materials Transportation for Calendar Years 1996-1997. The report has been prepared in accordance with the Federal hazardous materials transportation law, 49 U.S.C. 5121(e).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

## □ 1730

## SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THUNE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. NORWOOD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

## REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1776, AMERICAN HOMEOWNERSHIP AND ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 2000

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-562) on the resolution (H. Res. 460) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1776) to expand homeownership in the United States, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## PRESIDENTIAL DIRECTIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, most Americans possess little knowledge of or experience with the subject of presidential directives. Indeed, even those

familiar with executive orders and proclamations may not understand the full impact of these directives on Federal, State, and local laws or on the balance of power in this Nation.

By issuing executive orders, which infringe on congressional authority, it has become increasingly clear that the President is skirting the constitutional process and meddling in the legislative affairs of Congress. The result is a subtle erosion of our representative self-government and the rule of law.

The President seeks to expand his authority beyond what the Constitution allows. He is using directives to seize land, usurp State law, expand the Federal Government, and spend taxpayer dollars without congressional authorization. This definition of executive power would have astonished the framers of our constitution. Their structure of government deliberately rejected the British model, which gave the king all executive authority.

A steady increase in controversy over executive orders and presidential proclamations has arisen since FDR's first administration. Judging by the comments of the White House, we have even more reason to be concerned. Mr. Podesta, the President's Chief of Staff, has outlined the President's plan to issue a series of executive orders and other directives that will become the force and effect of law. Thus, if unchallenged, the President has taken legislative power without first getting the okay from Congress.

Congress should be outraged by the President's staff, as they look for ways to bypass the legislative branch. We have seen this before. When the President issued his Executive Order on striker replacement, he attempted to do what had been denied him by the regular legislative process. In addition, when the President issued his proclamation establishing a national monument in Utah, he again tried to do what he had been unable to do in Congress.

I am deeply concerned with executive lawmaking, and if Congress does not openly challenge the President, we are surely surrendering our liberty. It seems clear that the President plans on using Executive Orders and other presidential directives to implement his agenda without the consent of Congress. Executive lawmaking is a violation of the Constitution and the doctrine of separation of powers. As Article I states, all legislative powers shall be vested in the Congress.

In the legislative veto decision of 1983, the Supreme Court insisted that congressional power be exercised in accord with a single finely wrought and exhaustively considered procedure. The Court said that the records of the Philadelphia Convention and the State ratification debates provide unmistakable expression of a determination that the legislation by the national Congress be a step-by-step deliberate and deliberative process. If Congress is required to follow this rigorous process,