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Question: Why is your rent increasing by $74,000--that’s more than a 50 percent increase? ($142,000 in fiscal year 1992, $216,000 in fiscal year 1993)

Answer: The costs for rent in the 1993 Congressional Justification are based on preliminary data which have since been revised. The current estimated amounts for rent in fiscal year 1992 and fiscal year 1993 are $176,000 and $187,000, respectively, an increase of 6 percent to cover inflation.

Question: How do you justify these increases when you proposed to reduce your staffing by 10 percent?

Answer: The reduction in the FTE ceiling will not affect the OIE staffing level because the office has actually been operating at a level of 10 to 12 below its ceiling since 1988. The funding increases are needed in order to cover the operating costs of the proposed OIE FTE level and to maintain an effective level of operations.
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OPENING REMARKS

Mr. YATES. This is the hearing on the budget for fiscal year 1993 for the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Appearing in support of BIA's budget is its distinguished Assistant Secretary, Dr. Eddie Brown; Mr. Bettenberg; Mr. Lamb; and Mr. Trezise. It is Trezise?

Mr. TREZISE. Trezise.

Mr. YATES. Trezise; and from BIA itself, Mr. Matheson, the Deputy Commissioner of Indian Affairs; Mr. Parisian, Director, Office of Indian Education; Patrick Hayes, Director, Office of Trust and Economic Development; Ronald Eden, Director of the Office of Tribal Services; James Parris, Director of the Office of Trust Funds Management—he's got a problem; James Cain, Acting Director of the Office of Management and Administration; and Linda Richardson. Hi, Linda. You look wonderful.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Thank you, sir.

Mr. YATES. The years have dealt kindly with you.

GAO AUDIT OF INDIAN TRUST FUNDS

All right. Now the first subject we are going to take up is the question of the Indian trust funds. The General Accounting Office has been kind enough to respond to an inquiry of ours and to
Mr. Yates. Where you begin?
Mr. Brown. Yes.
Mr. Yates. Questions, Mr. Skeen?
Mr. Skeen. No, I have nothing further.

TRUST FUND INVESTMENTS IN BANKS THAT FAILED

Mr. Yates. All right. Anything else, Mr. Steinhoff, you want to tell us? It sounds like you’re making progress.

Staff tells me there’s a problem. “GAO has provided information to Chairman Synar, of the Government Operations Subcommittee, regarding trust funds which had been deposited in financial institutions which later failed.” What’s your current policy regarding investing trust funds in institutions above the insured limits of $100,000?

Mr. Brown. Let me turn to Mr. Jim Parris, who is director of the Office of Trust Funds Management. Jim, could you come up and talk?

Mr. Parris. Currently, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, if we invest in a bank, money that is in excess of the $100,000 limit, we require collateral by the bank, pledged securities.

Mr. Yates. Like with real estate? Like the S&Ls had?
Mr. Parris. No. They’ve got to pledge cash or give them securities.

Mr. Yates. Okay. Now GAO says that approximately $4 million in losses from failed institutions have been identified to date, and BIA is liable for these losses. Do you agree with that?

Mr. Parris. The losses incurred in banks that we placed the trust funds in, and yes, the Government.

Mr. Yates. Does that mean that we have to appropriate $4 million to make up for BIA’s losses, or have you got separate money of your own?

Mr. Brown. I think we’re looking at possibly two options for the overpayments and under payments, as well as looking at the possibility in the future of some additional appropriations.

Mr. Yates. When will you decide?
Mr. Brown. Do you know the—

Mr. Parris. We know the amounts. We’re working with the Solicitor’s Office in Interior to reach—

Mr. Yates. How many tribes are involved in the $4 million?

Mr. Parris. The majority of the money, I want to say 96 percent, 97 percent, involves individual Indian money accounts.

Mr. Yates. Of what tribe?

Mr. Parris. No particular tribe is affected by the losses. It’s a pool. All IIM monies are invested as a pool.

Mr. Yates. Oh

Mr. Parris. We invest between $400 million and $450 million for individual Indians as a pool.

Mr. Yates. Of all tribes?

Mr. Parris. Yes, sir.

Mr. Yates. Do you have adequate records to determine how much to pay each of the Indian owners?

Mr. Parris. Do we have adequate records? Yes.

Mr. Yates. Do you know who they are and how much each is to receive?

Mr. Parris. Yes. The way that the Individual Indian Money interest is distributed is, we base it on the individual balances in the accounts and then allocate the actual interest earned to those accounts. So we have those names and the percentage of allocations.

IIIM ACCOUNT INVESTMENTS NOT FULLY SECURED

Mr. Yates. Mr. Skeen?

Mr. Skeen. We have some questions in that regard. The $4 million is over and above those that were insured for the $100,000—

Mr. Parris. Right.

Mr. Skeen. [continuing] What happened to the assets that were supposed to be backing them up?

Mr. Parris. The—

Mr. Skeen. I mean, I understand you to say that when you had an account that you insured over $100,000, or that you had insurance up to $100,000, anything over that had to be covered by collateral of some kind. What’s happened to that collateral?

Mr. Parris. The—

Mr. Skeen. Do you have a record of it?

Mr. Parris. What happened is that we discovered that the banks and institutions that we had invested money in had failed and that FDIC—the SLIC at that time, had ruled that the insurance requirements were different from what we thought the insurance operation had understood. Part of the problem had to do with a difference in interpretation of insurability. Once we found and clarified that there was a problem related to these Individual Indian Money and their investment of the monies in these institutions, then, of course, we altered our procedures to adapt to our new situation. But at the time, we had not as clear an indication from the FDIC as to the insurability of these funds.

Mr. Skeen. What I gather is that you have no record at all, and of course there is no way to recoup on the assets if you have trouble with the overages.

Mr. Parris. Well, it’s just that our understanding of the insurability of the $100,000 limit and the applicability of that for individuals—when you have 300,000 individuals and the kind of money between $400 million and $450 million that we do, we had insured or invested the funds based on our understanding that it was insured, that they would be covered. Upon failure of these institutions, it came out in discussion with the FDIC and the SLIC that there was a problem.

Mr. Skeen. So you were covered with insurance, but you’re still $4 million short.

Mr. Parris. We were covered—our understanding, we invested based on flawed information, obviously. It was lack of interpretation. Part of the money was lost as a result of some embezzlement, too. There was about $1.5 million, $2 million, I believe, that was.

Mr. Skeen. Well, the basic question was, There’s nothing in there for recoupment?

Mr. Parris. That’s correct.