

Urban base reuse is generally easier than rural base reuse given a city's economic diversification and demand for the real estate and services that a redeveloped base might provide. As an example, the transformation of McCoy Air Force Base in Orlando into an air cargo transport hub brought about the employment of 6,000 people, easily compensating for the loss of 395 jobs.

Rural base reuse can also be successful given the proper planning. Presque Isle, closed in 1961, was located in an isolated rural location. However, the local leadership was able to transform the base into an economically diverse center by planning strategically, inviting outside companies to the site and prorating rent to the number of new jobs created. 1,302 jobs were created with new industrial tenants including Indian Head Plywood, Arrostook Shoe Company, International Paper, Converse Rubber Company, Northeast Publishing and a vocational training school.

Industrial parks are a popular option for base reuse. However, communities should be conscious of the wide variety of other possible projects. Air Force bases and naval air stations remain clear candidates for new municipal or regional airports and air cargo hubs. Redevelopment of former bases as schools has been a successful model with 47 bases closed in the 1960s and 1970s now having schools on them. And while using bases for low-income and homeless housing does not raise money through sale, it does achieve other important national objectives while allowing local governments to acquire the property at little or no cost. Other government uses are also possible, including administrative facilities, hospitals, postal distribution centers and offices, rehabilitation centers and prisons. Often, bases are large enough to accommodate public services and private developments under a "mixed-use" strategy.

#### INGREDIENTS OF SUCCESSFUL BASE CONVERSION

(1) Advance Planning; Communities should take full advantage of the protection provided by the law as well as the assistance provided by the Office of Economic Adjustment in the Defense Department to plan for base reuse before a closure occurs. They must evaluate the comparative advantages of alternative civilian purposes and the means of linking these economic development strategies with retraining options.

(2) The programs responsible for funding advance planning, economic development and retraining must all be funded sufficiently to provide adequate resources to support the base closure process.

(3) These programs, spread out over the Departments of Defense, Commerce and Labor, must be coordinated so that they can deliver comprehensive services efficiently.

(4) Cleanup funding should come from the DoD budget to discourage further pollution. The *Federal Facilities Compliance Act* and the federal agreements signed by the DoD, the EPA and State governments give State officials authority to enforce hazardous waste laws by levying fines and exacting other penalties on the Federal Government for lack of compliance with environmental regulations. Governor Pete Wilson of California recognized this right in a recent letter to Defense Secretary Perry stating, "California expects DOD to comply with the federal/state cleanup agreements it has signed at California military bases. DOD is contractually obligated to seek sufficient funding to permit environmental work to proceed according to the schedule contained in those agreements. California will not hesitate to assert its right under those agreements to seek fines, penalties and judicial orders compelling DOD to conduct required environmental work."

(5) There are many stakeholders in base reuse development. Local, state and federal government officials, private developers, universities, and local citizens and citizens groups all have a valuable role to play. No single party should be excluded or allowed to dominate the process. An active government role is essential to ensure that in instances where reuse is feasible, conversion plans carefully weigh the interests of private developers and the community's social and economic needs.

Since the bases are government property, the opportunity to use these former bases for public purposes should not be overlooked. A concerted planning effort, informed by an understanding of the differences among bases, is essential. With federal leadership and local activism, the downsizing of the military base structure could produce a host of assets to spur new economic development in communities across the nation.

#### IS AMERICA GOING TO LEAD?

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, there is an important question hanging over us like Damocles' sword today. It will loom over us as we consider the budget. It will confront us directly as we debate the reorganization of our foreign affairs agencies. The question is, Is America going to lead?

This is not a question that keeps people awake at night anymore. After all, people ask, we won the cold war, did we not? There is no longer any real threat to America's security, is there?

Mr. President, there have been few times in history when the United States can less afford to be complacent. The world today is anything but a predictable, peaceful place. While we are fortunate that the military threat to our security has receded, it is more true today than ever that American prosperity is linked to conditions in the rest of the world.

Millions of American jobs depend upon persuading other countries to open their borders of U.S. exports, and helping them raise their incomes so they can afford to buy our exports. Ensuring that we have clean air and clean water depends upon international action to protect the environment. Keeping Americans healthy depends on joint action to fight the spread of infectious diseases in other countries. Imagine if we are unable to contain the recent outbreak of a deadly virus in Zaire—very quickly you would see Senators clamoring for more aid to stop it from reaching our shores.

Stemming the flow of illegal immigrants and refugees to the United States depends on promoting democracy and economic development in the countries from which the refugees are fleeing. These are just a few examples of why we continue to have an enormous stake in what happens in the rest of the world.

Fortunately, the United States, the only remaining superpower with the largest economy and the most powerful military, can influence what happens in the rest of the world.

But influence is not automatic. It requires effort. And it costs money.

Perhaps most important, the United States needs to maintain its leadership in and its financial contributions to the international organizations that make critical contributions to promoting peace, trade, and economic development. Organizations like the United Nations, the World Trade Organization, the International Monetary Fund, and the World Bank, to name a few. These organizations are the glue that holds our international system together. They may not always act in precisely the way we would like, but they are dedicated to spreading the values that Americans hold dear—freedom, democracy, free enterprise, and competition.

The American people also want to help alleviate the suffering of people facing starvation or other calamities, like refugees fleeing genocide in Rwanda, or the hundreds of thousands of victims of landmines.

Finally Mr. President, the polls show that most Americans believe we should help developing countries and countries making the transition from communism to democracy and market economies. It is through this aid that we fight poverty, that we stabilize population growth, that we educate people who have never known anything except tyranny in the basics of representative government, and that we encourage countries to open their economies to trade and competition.

We do these things because it is in our national interest. Yet, in the rush to reduce Federal spending some are dismissing spending on international affairs as a luxury we cannot afford, or even a waste.

The United States cannot pay these costs alone, but no one is asking us to. The United States now ranks 21st among donors in the percentage of national income that it devotes to development assistance. Twenty-first. Right behind Ireland. We aren't even the largest donor in terms of dollar amount anymore. Japan, which has a keen sense of what is in its national interest, has passed us.

Six years ago, when I became chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, the foreign operations budget was \$14.6 billion. We cut that budget by 6.5 percent, not even taking into account inflation—while the remainder of the discretionary spending in the Federal budget increased by 4.8 percent. Those cuts were a calculated response to the end of the cold war. Foreign aid today is substantially less than it was during the Reagan and Bush administrations. Our entire foreign aid program, including funding for the Exim Bank and foreign military financing and other activities that have as much to do with promoting U.S. exports as with helping other countries, today accounts for less than 1 percent of the total Federal budget.

We must recognize that there is a limit to how far we can cut our budget for international affairs, and still maintain our leadership position in the world. Just when many people thought

U.S. influence was reaching new heights, we are seeing the ability of the United States to influence world events eroding.

This budget proposal amounts to a classic example of penny-wise and pound-foolish. Our allies are scratching their heads, wondering why the United States, with the opportunity to exercise influence in the world more cheaply than ever before, is turning its back and walking away. We are inviting whoever else wants to—friend or foe—to step into the vacuum and pursue their interests at our expense.

Mr. President, the United States stands as a beacon of liberty and hope for people throughout the world. But we should be more than a beacon. A beacon is passive. We should be proactive, reaching out to defend our interests, and to help our less-fortunate neighbors. We should continue to invest in the world. We should continue to lead.

Mr. President, I want to say a few words about Republican proposals to reform the U.S. foreign affairs agencies. Senator HELMS, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has launched a broad proposal to reform foreign policymaking in the Federal Government. This proposal includes provisions for completely restructuring the way we administer our foreign aid programs. Senator HELMS asserts that U.S. foreign policymaking has become so decentralized that it no longer serves the national interest. He proposes to merge most foreign affairs functions into the Department of State.

As the former chairman and now ranking Democrat on the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, I have had some opportunity to be involved in the U.S. Government's conduct of foreign policy, and I have some thoughts about Senator HELMS' proposal.

While I have long advocated better coordination among the executive branch agencies in foreign policymaking, I believe Senator HELMS' proposal would result in U.S. national interests being less well, not better, served.

Why is the Foreign Agricultural Service administered by the Department of Agriculture and not by the State Department? Because farmers know they can count on USDA to represent their interests better than the Department of State and all experiences have proven that.

Why, 15 years ago, did we take the commercial function away from the State Department and create a Foreign Commercial Service in the Department of Commerce? It was because State had for years neglected export promotion, sacrificed export interests to its foreign policy priorities, and treated its commercial officers as second-class employees. It was because the American business community was clamoring for something better.

The reason we have separate foreign service bureaucracies is that many of

our foreign policy interests are actually domestic policy interests that are best pursued abroad by technical experts from domestic policy agencies, not by foreign policy generalists from the State Department. I do not know about North Carolina farmers, but I can tell you that Vermont farmers are not at all anxious to see the State Department expand its influence over U.S. foreign agricultural policy. They fear that shifting power from domestic agencies to the State Department will not strengthen representation of United States interests in United States policy but rather will strengthen representation of French interests and Argentine interests and Russian interests.

Let me focus on the specific question of restructuring America's foreign assistance program. I have been advocating reform of our foreign aid program ever since the fall of the Berlin Wall, so I welcome this opportunity for discussion of this issue.

Senator HELMS says that our foreign aid program should further our national interests. I absolutely agree.

But I do not agree with his definition of the problem. The problem is not that the Agency for International Development is ignoring America's national interests. The problem is that since 1961 when the Foreign Assistance Act was enacted, much of our foreign aid was allocated to winning allies in the fight against communism. Billions went to right-wing dictatorships with little or no commitment to democracy or improving the living conditions of their people, or even allowing business competition. Much of that aid failed by the standards we apply today. But it is unfair and disingenuous to judge AID's effectiveness today against the failures of the past, when our goals were fundamentally different.

AID needs a new legislative mandate. We need to get rid of cold war priorities and replace them with priorities for the 21st century.

The Secretary of State has full authority under statute to give policy direction to AID, and the State Department influences AID's activities every day. If AID's projects deviate from State Department policy, it is not because AID is out of control, it is because the people at State are not paying enough attention to what AID is proposing to do.

Senator HELMS also does not give sufficient credit to the Clinton administration for its efforts to improve AID performance. Over the past 2 years, we have seen dramatic progress at the Agency for International Development and the Treasury and State Departments in redefining our foreign aid priorities and focusing resources where they can achieve the most in advancing U.S. interests abroad, in spite of the constraints of an obsolete Foreign Assistance Act.

AID Administrator Brian Atwood has made extensive changes at AID. He initiated an agency-wide streamlining ef-

fort that has resulted in the closure of 27 missions and a reduction of 1,200 staff. He is installing state-of-the-art data processing systems that link headquarters in Washington with project officers in the field in real time. This will ensure that information available at one end of the management pipeline is also available at the other, increasing efficiency and improving decisionmaking.

Mr. Atwood has decentralized decisionmaking so that people closest to problems have a full opportunity to design solutions. AID is improving its performance because, for the first time since the mid-1980's, it has hands-on leadership that is committed to making our foreign aid programs effective.

Can AID improve its management performance further? Yes. But would the State Department do better? I doubt it. I believe that abolishing AID and asking regional Assistant Secretaries at the State Department to manage its functions would be a serious mistake. These Assistant Secretaries are chosen for their expertise in broad foreign policy. Many do not have experience managing money and programs. And they are overworked now trying to deal with the daily emergencies and complexities of our political relationships with countries in their regions.

Even former Secretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger, a Republican, expressed doubt about this proposal in his testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee on March 23. "The State Department is not well suited, either by historical experience or current bureaucratic culture, to assume many of these new responsibilities," Secretary Eagleburger said. And he was trying to be supportive of the Helms proposal.

I would put the matter a little less delicately: The State Department's specialty is making policy; it has never and probably never will manage programs well. Secretary Eagleburger offered the hope that, with very careful selection of Under Secretaries, it might do better. I am reluctant to trade a bureaucracy that is doing reasonably well and getting better at delivering foreign aid for one that has no competence on the outside chance that it might get better. If we disperse responsibility for foreign aid among Assistant Secretaries of State, I bet that we will start hearing more stories about misguided and failed projects, not fewer, and more questions about why we have foreign aid, not fewer.

AID today is performing a wide array of tasks that enjoy overwhelming support among the American people.

Every year, AID manages programs worth \$1 billion aimed at protecting the Earth's environment. Does protecting the Earth's forests, oceans, and atmosphere matter to us? Does it further our foreign policy interests? A century from now we are not going to have any foreign policy if we do not join with

other countries today to protect the environment.

Every year, AID manages hundreds of millions of dollars in international health programs. Is this money wasted? We might as well ask whether AIDS and tuberculosis are infectious.

Every year, AID commits a large part of its budget to promoting free markets and democratic development in countries where the United States has important interests. This is not diplomacy. It is hands-on assistance that requires people with special expertise on the ground who can get the job done. Working with foreign governments and private organizations on the nuts and bolts of solving real problems. That is what AID does.

Mr. President, we have a strong need to rewrite the Foreign Assistance Act to redefine the framework for foreign aid. AID can continue to downsize and improve its efficiency. But we should not abolish an agency that is aggressively adapting itself to the changed world we live in and to the shrinking foreign aid budget.

#### OREGON RECIPIENTS OF OUTSTANDING COMMUNITY INVESTMENT AWARDS

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, as Congress begins the difficult task of confronting our Federal deficit and addressing the needs of our less-developed communities, we must focus on innovative ideas to meet these needs. Bureaucracy has often failed to provide successful solutions, making the formation of public-private partnerships necessary to jointly aid neighborhoods. Successful community development must be locally specialized. Attempts by Congress to write a Federal prescription for our Nation's underdeveloped communities will not succeed unless these strategies are sensitive to the diverse needs of those localities.

One organization is making a difference in developing communities by providing localized, market-guided assistance. The Social Compact is a coalition of hundreds of leaders from the financial services and community development industries who have combined their forces to strengthen America's at-risk neighborhoods, both urban and rural. Firmly grounded in John Locke's thesis of a covenant between members of society and the community from which one has prospered, emphasizing commonalities rather than accentuating differences, the Social Compact advocates a voluntary call to action, mobilizing institutions to invest their unique capabilities in neighborhood self-empowerment partnerships.

The Social Compact each year recognizes participating partnerships for their achievements in community development. I am pleased to announce that two partnerships in Oregon, the Portland Community Reinvestment Initiatives partnered with the U.S. Bank of Oregon, and the Northeast

Community Development Corp. partnered with First Interstate Bank of Oregon, each received the Social Compact's 1995 Outstanding Community Investment Award.

Portland Community Reinvestment Initiatives and U.S. Bank of Oregon were recognized for their efforts in reclaiming 350 properties located in some of Portland's most vulnerable areas. This pioneering response to an unprecedented affordable housing crisis in northeast Portland has given residents the opportunity to become homeowners and improve the supply of quality, affordable rental properties as a permanent community asset. Portland Community Reinvestment Initiatives was created by the city of Portland in an effort to provide a long-term remedy for large scale foreclosures facing northeast Portland. U.S. Bank of Oregon stepped forward with a pioneering financing solution. The outcome of this teamwork resulted in one-third of the homes being purchased by lower-income families and the remaining units are being rehabilitated into affordable rentals.

The Northeast Community Development Corp. and First Interstate Bank of Oregon were recognized for developing a comprehensive program to provide the opportunity for homeownership for 250 Portland families, reclaiming 4 vulnerable inner northeast Portland neighborhoods. Initially funded by a Federal Nehemiah Housing Opportunity grant, the Northeast Community Development Corp. original aim was to construct and renovate 250 single-family homes that would later provide first-time home ownership opportunities for lower and moderate-income families.

First Interstate took the lead in the project by providing construction financing, grant funding, and a line of credit for the development of the first five demonstration homes. First Interstate provided additional assistance by organizing a consortium of six local leaders to commit \$1.9 million in construction financing and first-time homebuyer programs for potential borrowers. As a result of this private-public teamwork, property values are rising in targeted areas, crime is decreasing, and residents have a renewed sense of pride in their neighborhood.

The ethic of civic responsibility and the spirit of community are fundamental principles which have guided our country's evolution. The award recipients from Oregon are stellar examples of these virtues in our modern times. They should serve as reminders of what can be accomplished when government acts locally in a creative alliance with the private sector.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Thomas, one of his secretaries.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

#### MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following measures were read the second time and placed on the calendar:

S. 761. A bill to improve the ability of the United States to respond to the international terrorist threat.

S. 790. A bill to provide for the modification or elimination of Federal reporting requirements.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. PRESSLER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, without amendment:

S. 625. A bill to amend the Land Remote Sensing Policy Act of 1992 (Rept. No. 104-81).

By Mr. DOMENICI, from the Committee on the Budget, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 13. An original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002 (Rept. No. 104-82).

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. COCHRAN:

S. 800. A bill to provide for hearing care services by audiologists to Federal civilian employees; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. HELMS:

S. 801. A bill to extend the deadline under the Federal Power Act applicable to the construction of two hydroelectric projects in North Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HOLLINGS:

S. 802. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation and coastwise trade endorsement for the vessel ROYAL AFFAIRE; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MCCAIN:

S. 803. A bill to amend the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 in order to revise the process for disposal of property located at installations closed under that Act pursuant to the 1995 base closure round; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BRADLEY:

S. 804. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the excise taxes on tobacco products, and to use a portion of the resulting revenues to fund a trust fund for tobacco diversification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.