

Today, Hispanics continue to contribute to the fabric of our community. On Long Island, I would like to acknowledge four residents of my constituency who are truly leaders among the Hispanic community and have flourished in their fields: Mr. Angel M. Rivera for his excellence in youth services; Miss Alexandra Feliciano for her outstanding academic leadership; Mr. Hector D. LaSalle for his contributions to the legal profession; and Dr. Dennis Da Silva for his dedicated activities in the medical field and community.

The list of achievements is endless. For that reason it is of utmost importance to honor the rich contributions of Hispanic-Americans in our society. I proudly applaud their efforts. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I commemorate Hispanic Heritage Month.

DISAPPROVING THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION

SPEECH OF

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 8, 1995

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the BRAC Commission's 1995 base closure list and in support of House Joint Resolution 2.

No where in the United States has BRAC had such a devastating impact as it has had in the Sacramento area. In all four rounds of BRAC the Sacramento area has shouldered well over a quarter of all jobs lost in California due to BRAC.

BRAC made a terrible decision to close McClellan AFB which I represent. Sacramento has been hit far more than any other community in this country. No where in the United States has a community been hit three separate times. Sacramento has already given its fair share to base downsizing.

I voted for the creation of an independent base closure commission because it would be insulated from the politics of individual Members of Congress and their districts so that BRAC could make fairminded decisions as to which bases ought to be closed based on the basis of national need.

However, I must say with great regret and dismay that this BRAC Commission was exceedingly political, made its decision in a vacuum, and in my mind deliberately inflicted undue pain on the people of Sacramento.

BRAC made its decision based not on the facts, but rather the politics of base closures, that up until now have been void from the process.

I believe that BRAC grossly distorted the process and abdicated its responsibility as an independent commission.

This decision was based on data and analysis generated by the Commission staff that was not certified. Further, there was no opportunity—even when specifically requested—for the Air Force or DOD to review the staff analysis and determine the operational impacts of the recommendations. The impacted communities were not provided with an opportunity to respond to this analysis either.

I believe that this approach seriously undermines what was designed to be an open and

fair process and contradicts the spirit of the BRAC statute.

I would like to discuss three areas where I feel that the BRAC Commission substantially deviated from the intent of the BRAC statute as well as its total disregard for the Department of Defense's recommendations. In my mind and the minds of many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that have been adversely affected by this decision, the BRAC Commission clearly subverted and deviated from the BRAC statute and past BRAC Commissions.

ECONOMIC IMPACT

The Sacramento region has suffered two previous base closures—Mather AFB (1988) and the Sacramento Army Depot (1991). These closures resulted in the loss of 11,516 direct jobs and 28,090 total.

The closure of McClellan will result in a loss of 13,000 direct jobs and over 31,000 total jobs.

The total combined effect of all three closures results in over 59,000 total jobs lost which represents 7.8 percent of the region's total employment. These three closures make Sacramento the hardest hit community in the entire country for all four BRAC rounds.

MILITARY READINESS

The recommendations to close McClellan and Kelly are simply unacceptable. Of all the options for eliminating excess capacity in the Air Force depot system, the Commission's approach will cause the most turbulence, will cost the most money, and will have the most negative impact on mission support capabilities.

The substitution of judgment by the BRAC staff on the cost and savings associated with these two bases is deeply troubling. Changing assumptions and parameters based on anecdotal information and running COBRA analyses using nonbudget quality data and with no input from military officials are causes for great concern.

A review of the military's BRAC budgets demonstrates that previous cost assessments of prior rounds understated. In fact, earlier this year, the Navy reprogrammed more than \$700 million from operations and maintenance accounts to cover cost overruns in its base closure account. We should not risk the readiness of our troops on a cost and savings evaluation which did not receive the same level of budget scrutiny as Secretary Perry's original recommendations.

In a letter dated June 21, 1995, Secretary of the Air Force Sheila Widnall and Air Force Chief of Staff Ron Fogleman wrote to the BRAC Commission that "the staff generated BRAC proposal described to us will * * * preclude the Air Force from carrying through on vital readiness and modernization programs."

Secretary Widnall and General Fogleman further stated that "the essential business of the Air Force * * * would be greatly disrupted."

CROSS-SERVICING

There is widespread agreement, including the recently published Commission of Roles and Missions Report, that cross-servicing and privatization are the smartest, cheapest, and least disruptive methods of downsizing large industrial facilities. Every major study in this area, from the Defense Science Board to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, agree that cross-servicing

and privatization are the right way to downsize depot maintenance.

The fact that neither the Defense Department nor the Commission were successful in instituting cross-servicing in a comprehensive manner to remove redundancies among the services is a major disappointment.

In my view, the Commission's recommendations are not an appropriate or acceptable substitute for eliminating capacity in defense industrial facilities the right way through cross-servicing.

This BRAC list comes up short. The enormous costs, loss of capabilities, and overall impact on readiness are too great a risk. There is a right way and a wrong way to downsize depots. This is definitely the wrong way.

I understand probably better than most that we as a Congress have the responsibility to close bases down that are unneeded in the wake of the end of the Soviet Union and the cold war.

But BRAC's decision risks readiness, will not eliminate excess capacity, and asks the people of Sacramento to shoulder a far higher proportion of pain than does the rest of the country.

The BRAC Commission has gone too far this time, I ask my colleagues to support this resolution and reject the Commission's ill-advised recommendations.

THE GREEN REVENUE PATH

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1995

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, as we consider changes to the Tax Code, I hope that we can consider bills to discourage pollution and the depletion of scarce natural resources.

I've long proposed these kinds of tax changes, and I am today introducing the first in a series of such tax bills—a bill which will eliminate various subsidies designed to encourage the consumption of polluting materials and the destruction of scarce natural resources.

I would like to enter in the RECORD at this point an excellent op ed on this subject which appeared in the September 10 Washington Post entitled, "The Green Revenue Path." Over the coming months, I plan to introduce other bills to advance the ideas contained in this article.

THE GREEN REVENUE PATH—FOR HEALTHY GROWTH, WASHINGTON SHOULD TAX RESOURCES, NOT LABOR

(By Ted Halstead and Jonathan Rowe)

For all the talk of radical tax reform in Washington, there's a basic question that the politicians and experts have somehow missed. The leading proposals, whether Democratic or Republican, are justified by what they wouldn't tax—capital gains, interest income, etc.—not by what they would tax. Purporting to encourage savings and investment, these proposals would all tend to shift the burden of taxation in one way or another from income onto work—that is, onto the folks who, in Sen. Phil Gramm's apt phrase, "pull the wagon."

There's a better way, one that doesn't penalize the things—work and enterprise—that America needs most. Instead of taxing the creation of wealth, the government ought to