

Madam Speaker, national security is a powerful concept; and in the name of national security, we have done extraordinary things, perhaps none more momentous than the victory during World War II and the huge mobilization that it required.

At times we use national security to cover up things perhaps we should not do, some tragic mistakes abroad, not being truthful with the American public. Here at home, we have occasionally used national security to rationalize good things we probably should have done anyway. Our interstate highway system was done in the name, in part, of national defense, or the student defense loans in the 1960s and 1970s, or research that led to the Internet.

Today there is no greater threat to our national security worldwide than is posed by pollution, poverty, disease, and the unrest and misery that they produce.

We have serious environmental problems here at home that are the terrible hidden legacy of 60 years of our defense activities, among them, in my own Pacific Northwest, the terrible pollution at the Hanford Nuclear Reservation, or Rocky Flats in Colorado, chemical weapons, toxic waste.

One of the most powerful ways to protect the environment and make community livable is for the Federal Government to lead by example, whether it is maybe requiring a post office to obey local land use laws and zoning codes and planning regulations, or have the GSA lead by example, being an exemplary landlord in our communities around the country, or maybe having the Federal Flood Insurance program reformed so it does not subsidize people living in places where God has repeatedly shown that he does not want them.

But the biggest, richest, and most visible opportunity to lead by example is to be found in the Department of Defense, whether, as I mentioned on this floor before, dealing with model ways to environmentally sensitively dismantle ships, or look at the opportunities posed by base closings around the country.

Our population is going to double in the course of this century. There are many great examples of over the long haul how, done right, base closings can help save the taxpayers' money and revitalize communities, not devastate them.

Army facilities nationwide are rich in historic buildings, structures, and districts. These historic properties potentially represent a significant and valuable heritage not just for the Army but for the Nation and particularly for the community in which they are located.

The National Trust for Historic Preservation has helped develop a methodology for this and has helped launch more than 1,500 commercial districts around the country to be revitalized. There is a tremendous potential for them to work with us nationally with military projects.

Look at Fort Ord, with 28,000 acres, the largest military base closed in the country. It is now the campus for California State University at Monterey Bay. More than 1,100 new jobs have been created already. Seven thousand acres have been turned over to the Bureau of Land Management to be preserved as open space.

Unfortunately, since the base was closed in 1993, the housing has not yet been returned to the community for reuse due to burdensome bureaucratic requirements and, even though some progress has been made in the course of this last year, not before much damage has been caused to the vacant housing and loss to the community.

We could speak further about the opportunities before embarking upon new projects. I think it is important for the military to deal with the legacy of the problems we have now.

One such legacy of military operations is the threat left by bombs and shells that did not go off when fired for testing and training. Commonly we are talking about 5 or 10 percent. It is estimated it is going to cost \$15 billion to remove this unexploded ordnance in the United States alone. At the rate of \$150 million that we are spending a year now, it is going to take over 100 years to deal with this problem.

The budget for environmental security in the Department of Defense is \$4 billion out of a total budget of \$305 billion. It is time for us to take a step back to make sure that, if we can in the name of politics give the military money it cannot afford for projects that it does not need or want, then in the name of environment and livable communities, we can pay the bill and do it right.

Department of Defense Should Lead By Example

Monday, 10 April 2000 19:00

This is a special opportunity for the Department of Defense and Congress. We should not take shortcuts with the environment in the name of national security. Instead, the Department of Defense should lead by example for more livable communities.