You are using the statement of ''absolutely the best technology'' to delay the deployment of a strong and effective ballistic missile defense. You are needlessly placing the lives of tens of millions of Americans at risk of destruction by long-range ballistic missiles. You are attempting to deceive Congress.

Additional Funding—You claim that additional funding of ballistic missile defense programs will not buy back any time in its already ''fast-paced schedule.'' You contradict the Navy's report on its Theater Wide ballistic missile defense program, which points out how additional funding can bring development by 2002 rather than 2006. You contradict the experience of the Space Based Laser program, where lack of funding, especially under President Clinton, has restrained progress. Your views are invalid.

President Clinton is starving the funding of the Space Based Lasers, precluding their deployment. President Clinton canceled Brilliant Pebbles. Yet funding can revive those programs. Still you deny the American people a defense against long range ballistic missiles.

ABM Treaty—You and the Chiefs of Staff believe adherence to the ABM Treaty is consistent with our national security interests. But the ABM Treaty invited the massive buildup of the Soviet nuclear missiles, and the Soviet Union flagrantly violated its provisions. You have been silent about these violations of ''arms control'' agreements.

Furthermore, in April 1991, Dr. Henry Kissinger, author of the 1972 ABM Treaty, repudiated the treaty for being inconsistent with our national security interests, writing, ''Limitations on strategic defense will have to be reconsidered in the light of the Gulf War experience. No responsible leader can henceforth leave his civilian population vulnerable.''

You are irresponsible with American lives, leaving tens of millions of Americans vulnerable to swift, massive destruction by long-range ballistic missiles.

Position of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—The Joint Chiefs of Staff recommends the deployment of a ballistic missile defense at 25 U.S. cities to save the lives of 30 to 50 million U.S. citizens. The Joint Chiefs of Staff believes it is worthwhile deploying a ballistic missile defense to save the lives of tens of millions of Americans.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff believes that the deployment of a ballistic missile defense will limit the ability of a ballistic missile attack to damage our population, industry, and military.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff believes that the deployment of a ballistic missile defense will provide the U.S. a strategic advantage that will enable us to peacefully settle crises around the world.

These views of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for the deployment of a ballistic missile defense, confident in our technological ability to build an effective ballistic missile defense, provide timely advice for Congress although made in 1966.

In spite of the increasing dangers we face, and in spite of the advances in ballistic missile defense technology we have had in 32 years, you find the advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to be without merit.

Summary—There is no substitute for a strong defense against long-range ballistic missiles. Your actions and policy of leaving the American people undefended from long range ballistic missiles is indefensible.

Your letter presents Congress with more than a credibility gap. Your leadership, the leadership of President Clinton and his Administration, and the defense of the American people are incompatible.

You, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and President Clinton are needlessly risking the lives of tens of millions of Americans. You are inviting a nuclear Pearl Harbor. But the defense of the American people from the threat of long-range ballistic missiles will not admit delay.

It is inconceivable, sir, to arrive at any other conclusion but that you are culpable of dereliction of duty, leaving the lives of tens of millions of Americans undefended from long-range ballistic missile attack.

Your Commander-in-Chief President William Jefferson Clinton and his assistant Vice-President Al Gore are also derelict in their duty to defend American lives.

Very truly yours,

BOB SCHAFFER,
Member of Congress.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE SIDNEY R. YATES

SPEECH OF

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 1, 1998

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to my good friend and colleague, SID YATES.

Since first joining this Congress a remarkable fifty years ago, SID has been a paragon of conscience and decency, shaping this great Nation for the better through quiet perseverance and boundless idealism.

I have had the pleasure of serving with SID on the Appropriations Committee and have watched in admiration as he successfully funded scores of worthwhile projects, many of enormous benefit to our environment. Years from now, when our children and grandchildren enjoy scenic vistas and waterways, when they walk along gleaming lake fronts and thrill to the diversity of our Nation's wildlife, they will have SID YATES to thank. He has always understood our powerful moral obligations to be custodians of the great outdoors.

Just as important has been SID's championship of the arts. In the midst of controversy and contention, SID has always been a staunch and eloquent defender of the NEA. To those who would inflame public passions about the controversial margins of the artistic world, SID responded with a calm affirmation of the arts' central role in our national life. How many orchestras and exhibitions, how many performances and plays, owe their very existence to SID's faithful leadership? Indeed, the NEA itself might have been overwhelmed by its critics had not SID YATES been a member of this Congress.

For me, it has also been a great honor to sit with SID YATES on Appropriations' Foreign Operations Subcommittee. There, he has been an articulate spokesperson for American leadership around the world and a fierce defender of Israel's interests. It is entirely fitting that SID's first election to Congress should occur in the very year of Israel's declaration of statehood. And that, from this high vantage, SID should be able to watch Israel's development from a threatened outpost between the desert and the sea, to a modern, thriving nation, bursting with technology, artistry, and innovation. SID YATES played no small role in Israel's inspiring progress.

Mr. Speaker, SID YATES leaves this House diminished by his departure, yet wiser for his service. I know that SID YATES' integrity and courage will remain a model to countless public servants for many years to come.

HU KOMPLIMENTA I PLANUN HAGÅTÑA

SPEECH OF

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 7, 1998

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to commend the efforts of the many citizens on Guam who organized and actively took part in ''Project Hagåtña.'' This island-wide initiative has connected generations on Guam with our Chamorro heritage and has instilled in us our common values as a people longing to strengthen our identity and culture as native pacific-islanders. Project Hagåtña Project Hagåtña incorporated a multi-faceted approach by sponsoring scores of events that built upon our cultural backgrounds and renewed our energy to learn our history. The events were planned in confluence with the Centennial of the Spanish American War.

As my colleagues may know, the Guam legislature recently changed the name of our capital city from ''Agana'' to ''Hagåtña '' (Guam Public Law 24–162) in hopes of restoring and promoting our ancestral village names while at the same time trying us to our cultural roots.

I would like to commend the following individuals for their remarkable efforts in coordinating Project Hagåtña: Lourdes C.N. Ada, Benigno-Joseph Umagat, John San Nicolas, Annabelle Perez, Jeffrey Edubalad, Teresita N. Taitano, Robert J. Umagat, John Garica, Donna Paulino, Lelani Farrales, Lourdes Alonso, Kennedy Jim, Mayleen San Nicolas, Josusa M. Hayes, Clotlde R. Peredo, Patrick S. Leddy, and Peter Alexis Ada.

My congratulations to the people of Guam on the success of Project Hagåtña, may its work continue to remind us of our unique cultural place in the world and strengthen our heritage.

H.R. 4717: DRAFT OF THE CONSERVATION AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 1999

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 7, 1998

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, since July 17, 1998, Congressman JOHN DINGELL, W.J. ''BILLY'' TAUZIN, RICHARD BAKER, CHRIS JOHN, and I have been circulating a discussion draft and asking for comments to help further this legislative proposal. Our proposal is based on the idea that funds derived from outer continental shelf or OCS activities should be shared with coastal states impacted by the development, as well as reinvested into conservation. Today, we, along with several of our colleagues, will be introducing H.R. 4717.

To set the stage we must digress to the topic of oil and gas revenues paid to the Federal Treasury by companies involved in producing the federal mineral estate. Currently, would-be oil and gas operators on our public lands, and in federal waters, must bid for a

lease at auction, pay rent on this tract if successful with their bid, and pay a royalty on each cubic foot of natural gas and barrel of oil produced. The receipts from oil and gas development onshore, in states like New Mexico and Wyoming, are shared with the state which hosts the federal lease. Generally, half of the revenues the federal government receives from mineral development is shared with these public and land states.

However, oil and gas produced in the federal waters of the OCS is not shared in this manner with adjacent states. There have been numerous attempts to address this inequity. Most have failed at the hands of large states like California and Florida with the help of the environmental community opposed to OCS revenue-sharing because they perceived it as incentive for new oil and gas production. One of the first negotiations took place between Louisiana Governor Earl Long and President Truman. Governor Long has a long history of quotable and embellished stories, but this one is told as follows: Governor Long approached President Truman regarding the issue of revenue from offshore drilling with his state of Louisiana. President Truman, sympathetic, came back with an offer of 50% of the revenues to be shared with impacted adjacent states, such as Louisiana. Governor Long, in typical Earl Long style replied that if Louisiana could not get its due of 100%, it wanted nothing at all. And since that day Louisiana and the other coastal states received just that.

Which brings us to where we are today. With more than 90% of the offshore federal production occurring off the coast of Louisiana, no state is more energized when this issue of revenue sharing is brought up. Past proposals had formulas which favored producing coastal states such as Louisiana and Texas, which have been supportive of responsible development of OCS oil and gas resources. Some previous proposals even penalized states like Florida and California who annually seek a moratorium on OCS leasing. Not so, this time. We all realize the necessity of keeping our large states supportive of in order to have major legislation passed into law.

It seems appropriate to thank those individuals and groups involved with this bill introduction. The proposal has been a process-driven, seeking input from a diverse array of individuals and groups. Countless meetings and information exchanges occurred throughout the summer and into the fall. Any success realized today, with this bill introduction, came from the diversity of the participants and our determination to stay true to an open process and dialogue. Today, you find Congressman that run the spectrum of ideology and geography together supporting this bill. You see the same with the groups who have come out to support this endeavor and I look forward to continuing this collaboration.

Since July, when Congressman DINGELL, TAUZIN, BAKER and JOHN and I began circulating a discussion draft, posted it to the House Resources Committee website, we have been affirmatively seeking comments on the specifics of this idea. I can't stress enough our desire for critical input. Most of our discussion draft ideas were based upon existing reports or programs. Your input has been critical to making this proposal realize it's legislative potential. Today, we are moving into the next step in our process by introducing this bill. Yes, the 105th Congress is nearly finished, but we felt it worthwhile to formally introduce a legislation for thorough scrutiny until the 106th Congress meets. And the citizens of Alaska so willing, I intent to come back and re-introduce the Conservation and Reinvestment Act of 1999 early next year. Please understand, today's introduction does not signal the end our dialogue. I am committed to working with all interested individuals and groups to improve this bill next Congress, should compelling arguments for further amendments. I am dedicating myself to continue the dialogue begun four months ago into the 106th Congress, and working together, we can build a coalition sufficient to enact the ''Conservation and Reinvestment Act of 1999'' into law.***HD***Title I

The first title of the Conservation and Reinvestment Act will redistribute 27% of the total OCS receipts in a given year and is based on a Minerals Management Service's advisory committee's report. This report was prepared by the Administration and local government officials, and oil and gas industry representative, and conservation-community interests. The panel took a pragmatic approach, by suggesting only revenues from new oil and gas development be considered. While this reduces Budget Enforcement Act-induced concerns, it was troublesome to the environmental community because of the implementation that such revenue-sharing would be a strong incentive for new development. Hence, our bull utilizes all revenue, from both existing production and new leases. With this change not only will the funding levels increase to benefits the programs included in our bill, but we wanted to address the environmental community concerns from the outset.

Let's be candid about the perception that this bill includes incentives for oil and gas production. The only true incentive for a company to produce oil and gas, onshore or offshore, is the price of a barrel of oil or cubic foot of gas. A company examines the economics when making its development decisions. Companies will not decree to place a billion-dollar rig offshore based on a state or local government official's desire to increase their share of the fund our legislation would establish. They invest in the OCS if, and only if, they have reasonable expectations of making a profit. Obviously, even in today's oil & gas price environment, many companies have decided to compete in our OSC—especially in the Gulf of Mexico, but also in the Beaufort Sea, and even on existing leases off California.

Would they like to know their royalties are put to noble purposes for the good of taxpayers throughout the Nation? Well, of course, The Land and Water Conservation Fund primarily fueled by OCS receipts does just that, and has since 1965. But, no one believes LWCF has been an incentive for oil and gas drilling, rather its just been a good idea to reinvest some of our oil and gas dollars in the acquisition of lands and conservation of our renewable resources by both state and federal entities.

In addition, we have asked the Minerals Management Service to prepare data to show the amount of new production which would be necessary to increase a state's allocable share by 10%. Preliminary data shows that if all existing leases were to begin producing offshore California, there would be an increase in California's allocable share of only 1 percent, or about $1 million annually. I strongly doubt the people of California would abide new development off their coast simply to gain this revenue for coastal impact assistance.

I argue that this issue of incentives is a ''red herring.'' When a rational person examines the funding distribution, released today, they will see states like Florida and California as some of the largest recipients of impact assistance, despite the current and likely future leasing moratoria. Nevertheless we wish to address the perception of incentives. We are and have always been committed to keeping this bill free of drilling incentives as this is revenue-sharing legislation, pure and simple. To date, we have not received one comment which provides an adequate alternative to funding distribution to areas impacted by OCS development. But, we will work with individuals and groups in finding alternative which accomplishes the goal of providing funds to areas impacted by development which factors in the amount of development adjacent to a given state.***HD***Title II

The second title of the Conservation and Reinvestment Act reinvests 23% of the OCS funds into land-based conservation efforts, with a focus on the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF). More than 30 years ago, the LWCF Act created a unique partnership between Federal, State and local governments by authorizing matching grants for the acquisition and development of recreation and conservation resources. Similarly, the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Program (UPARR), created in 1978, provided Federal funds to distressed urban areas to rehabilitate and construct recreation areas. Together, these programs strived to develop a national system of parks that would, day-in and day-out, meet the recreation and open-space demands of the American public. Our proposal recognizes the noble potential within these programs and provides the stable funding they have been lacking.

LWCF monies have helped fund over 37,500 State and local projects including campgrounds, trails, playgrounds, and parks throughout the country. UPARR grants have been used to rehabilitate and develop nearly 1,500 urban recreation and park projects in more than 400 local jurisdictions. Yet, with the ever increasing demands of Americans for accessible recreation facilities, State and local governments have identified nearly $3 billion in capital investment needs nationally over the next five years for land acquisition and new construction. Nonetheless, despite the successes of the state-side LWCF matching grant and UPARR programs and the continuing demand for recreation and conservation resources, neither program has been funded over the past three years.

Title two of our bill would revitalize the LWCF and UPARR programs by providing matching grants to federal, state, local, and urban governments for the acquisition and development of conservation and recreation resources. Our bill provides annual funding which in many years provides funding at full $900 million levels. This bill will recommit Congress to the vision that revenues earned from the depletion of a nonrenewable resource should be invested in permanent assets that will serve the conservation and recreation needs of all Americans.

The 23% for land-based conservation would be distributed as follows:

42% to be utilized for Federal LWCF;

42% to State and local conservation and recreation projects; and

16% to fund UPARR programs.

It is important to point out that the funds allocated for State and local conservation and recreation projects only could fund one-half of the projects' costs and all expenditures would have to be consistent with the States' comprehensive outdoor recreation plans. Also the stated, territories, the District of Columbia, Indian tribes, and Alaska Native Village Corporations would all be eligible to receive matching grant funds.***HD***Title III

For over six years, some segments of the conservation community have advocated the creation of an excise tax to provide funding for non-game wildlife projects and conservation education. Included in this bill is funding for wildlife conservation and education. Conservation education is critical to ensuring that people understand the interdependence between man and the environment. We are losing the idea that people and the environment that surrounds them not only can coexist, but must coexist. As the urban sprawl envelops more of the public geography and ideology, we must work to educate with the principles of sustainable use. Hiking, biking, bird-watching, canoeing, mountain climbing, and hunting are all sustainable and acceptable uses of our lands and resources. Education by using sound scientific principles is the only way to ensure that our use of our resources will be sustainable for future generations.

Another void this legislation helps to fill, is the issue of game vs. non-game funding. This issue divides the sporting community who need unity to accomplish our common goals. The excise tax initiative, while well intentioned, was divisive as it created segmented funding for a particular species of wildlife. Our bill provides funding for both species of wildlife, game and non-game through the existing mechanism of Pittman-Robertson.

Pittman-Robertson currently allows for the flexibility to address the needs of non-game species, as well as game species. We all realize that Pittman-Robertson is currently focused on funding game species. However, our bill will create a new subaccount, named the ''Wildlife Conservation and Restoration'' subaccount. The conservation and Reinvestment Act of 1998 will provide funding at higher levels than any other federal source for wildlife. Above levels proposed by the excise tax initiative. This will provide wildlife funding to help move the conservation community beyond the debate of game versus non-game funding and provide for conservation education. This funding is provided with the knowledge that many states will utilize them for non-game and watchable species and these functions can take place with the bill as drafted. However, we allow the flexibility for individual states to maximize their digression.

I am very active in the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus and am currently the chairman of the Executive Council. The Sportsmen's Caucus is the largest Caucus in the Congress and sportsmen's champion. Far too often, our sportsmen and women are criticized for their outdoor recreation. The mass public does not understand our role in the economy or appreciate our heritage. The sporting community, represented by those who enjoy and utilize the outdoors are a huge segment to our Nation's economy. Members of the Caucus leadership, like SAXBY CHAMBLISS often incorporate our significance in their speeches. We should take a moment to realize how much our sportsmen contribute to the economy and environment.

If hunting and fishing were a corporation, it would rank 10th on the Fortune 500 list. This is ahead of giant corporations like AT&T.

Sportsmen activities support more than twice the number of workers employed by Wal-Mart. Wal-Mart, incidently, Wal-Mart is the largest Fortune 500 employer.

Sportsmen's assets equal, $60 billion in retail sales, 1.9 million jobs supported, and $8.7 billion in state and federal tax revenues. Economists estimate that these factors create a $169 billion ripple effect in our country's economy.

Some additional facts related to the taxes the sporting community pays are also interesting:

Tax revenues generated by sportsmen are greater than the box office total of all United States movie theaters. Also, exceed the combined box office earnings of the all-time top ten grossing films.

Federal tax revenues generated by sportsmen could pay for the combined budgets of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Endangered Species appropriation, Bureau of Land Management, National Biological Service, and National Park Service. For two years!

Federal tax revenues from New York sportsmen alone could pay for the entire U.S. Forest Service fish and wildlife budget. Pennsylvania sportsmen could pick-up the same tab.

Sportsmen's sales tax revenues generated in North Dakota, South Dakota, Vermont, and West Virginia could pay for their state's entire parks and recreation budgets.

All of you are well aware that the sporting community, especially those who engage in hunting and fishing, have been supporting the larger community of outdoor recreation for decades. Their generous contributions through the sportsmen trust accounts of Dingell-Johnson and Pittman-Robertson have immeasurably benefitted wildlife and their habitat. With that success in mind, I look forward to working with all individuals and groups to see this new subaccount passed into Law.

TRIBUTE TO PETER C. EAGLER

HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 7, 1998

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to your attention the Honorable Peter C. Eagler of Clifton, New Jersey. Peter is being honored this evening by the Clifton Democratic Club for his many years of invaluable service to the community.

Peter Eagler is a lifelong resident of the City of Clifton. In 1972, he graduated from Paul VI High School whereupon he entered Fairleigh Dickinson University as an undergraduate. He graduated from Fairleigh in 1976 with a Bachelor of Arts degree in Political Science and Russian Area Studies.

Peter has been employed by the New Jersey Highway Authority in Woodbridge since 1977 and is also a Coordinator for the PNC Bank Art Center, formerly the Garden State Art Center. He previously worked as an Assistant Coordinator for the Art Center and as a Coordinator of Heritage Festivals.

Peter's career in politics began back in 1974 when he was first elected to serve on the Clifton Democratic County Committee. He then became an active participant in several campaigns in North Jersey including being County Coordinator for Jimmy Carter's Presidential campaign, County Coordinator for Jim Florio's 1977 bid for Governor, member of the Steering Committee for Gloria Kolodziej's campaign for City Council, and County Coordinator for both Gary Hart's Presidential Primary bid and the Freeholder campaign in 1984. Peter also served Jim Florio's campaign again in 1989, as an advisor to the campaign's Ethnic Coordinator.

In 1990, Peter ran for a seat on the Clifton City Council and was elected. In 1994 and, again in 1998, he was re-elected to serve on the Council. As a member of the Council, he has served, and continues to serve, as liaison to the Planning Board and the Environmental Advisory Board, Chair of the Certificate of Occupancy Committee, and a member of both the Recreational Task Force and Real Estate Committees.

In 1995, Peter ran unsuccessfully for Freeholder but ran again and was elected to the Board of Chosen Freeholders in 1996. As Freeholder, Peter served as Chairman of the Community Services, Education, and Recreation Committee. In November 1997, the Democratic Party gained a majority on the Freeholder Board and in January of 1998, Peter was chosen as the new Director of the Freeholder Board.

Outside of his political involvements, Peter is also an active member of the community. He has been President of St. John Kanty's Parish Council (1975–1977), Administrator of Hamilton House (1981–1987), member of Passaic County's Sesquicentennial Commission (1985–1987), the Governor's Ethnic Inaugural Committee, the Clifton Historical Commission (1975–1990), and the Lakeview Civic Association. In December 1993, he was ordained a Subdeacon in Holy Apostles Church. Currently, Peter serves as a Trustee of Holy Archangel Broadcasting and is a Coordinator of the St. Nicholas Program at the Hamilton House Museum.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me, our colleagues, and Peter's family and friends in paying tribute to one of North Jersey's most dedicated servants of the community, the Honorable Peter C. Eagler.

HOME HEALTH CARE PAYMENTS

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 7, 1998

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. COYNE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. MCGOVERN of Massachusetts, I am today introducing a bill to help ameliorate the impact of the home health agency interim payment system and to delay the scheduled 15% cut in home health agency payments scheduled for next fall.

Our bill is revenue neutral.

It is different from the bill being developed by some of the Republicans on the Ways and