

not go away and is a major factor, but it is not the only one, nor is it the most important.

Let us review where we are now. Through four rounds of base closure that began a decade ago, we have slashed 21 percent of the U.S.-based plant replacement value of base structure. Ninety-seven major bases have been closed in the United States. We have cut our overseas basing structure by 43 percent, ceasing operations at over 960 facilities. The Army in Europe alone has closed the equivalent of 12 United States major maneuver bases.

Taken together, we have gotten rid of 27 percent of the base structure at a very high price, but it had to be done. By 2001, the taxpayer will have spent an estimated \$23 billion to close just the U.S.-based infrastructure closing or realigning under the BRAC.

Will we save money? I do not doubt that measured over a 20-year period in terms of net present value that money will be saved. But there is a real question about how much. No one knows. Every savings figure is merely an estimate, and an incomplete one at that.

I want to cite three examples of where these problems are. In its budget estimates to accompany the fiscal year 1996 budget request, DOD estimated that revenues from the sale and disposal of land from the first three rounds of BRAC would amount to \$815.3 million. This year DOD's estimate is \$277 million, a 66-percent reduction in just 2 years.

DOD projects annual recurring savings after 2001 for all BRAC rounds of \$5.6 billion annually. However, that figure does not take into account the expected ongoing environmental cleanup costs or the caretaker cost for property that cannot be disposed of at that point. Those costs are estimated conservatively, in my judgment, at \$500 million a year.

Approximately 51 percent of the savings which DOD assumes will come from BRAC during the implementation are due to assumed savings in operation and maintenance costs. Much of those assumed savings are due to reductions in civilian personnel.

What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that now is not the time. We need to do this in a more reasoned and careful manner.

CIVILIAN-MILITARY RELATIONS IN GUAM IS BEING FRACTURED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Guam [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, in Guam and many other American communities children are at the forefront of our Government policies, and like many communities, children are also at the forefront of our relationship with the military, whose large presence on Guam is well-known to many of the

Members of this Chamber. Those in Guam and here in Washington must understand the dimensions of this history.

The military's recently announced intention to establish Department of Defense Dependent Schools on Guam will divide an island for which over the past few decades community leaders, elected leaders, and military leaders have worked hard to dismantle barriers that force the perception of two separate communities on Guam. The barriers were coming down until the military announced that they were returning the school system on Guam to the pre-World War II era.

The school system prior to the World War II was divided. Military dependents attended a school called the American School, while local Chamorro children attended local schools. The naval government's official policy on education at the time was "to provide every possible means to ensure that the children of American residents in Guam shall not suffer perhaps permanent injury" because of their residence on Guam. This was perceived as an indication that those native to Guam were not good enough.

After World War II, although the school system in name was integrated, in reality, the districting was manipulated by the Navy to maintain segregated schools. Although the naval government operated all of the schools on the island and was thus responsible for the quality of education on Guam, double standards were maintained. When the relationship was finally integrated in the 1960's, when I was in high school and completing my education, and just as the process took time to heal here on segregation in the United States, so did the feelings of segregation on Guam. It took years to build relationships between the civilian and military community on Guam, and now this is being destroyed.

What we have worked in Guam so hard to dismantle is easily built up by the military. The military has pursued this issue inexhaustibly. They call it Operation Bright Vision. Maybe in the shortsighted eyes of military planners on Guam, this is a bright vision. With the President's announced initiative of one America to bring together people of different races, setting up the dynamics to divide the community on Guam is clearly the wrong vision for all of America. Rather than bright vision, it is a dark cloud over Guam and the rest of the United States.

The military will attempt to characterize this issue as a failed contract. Yes, they did have a contract for monetary payment with the Government of Guam, but those were for administrative reports. The Government of Guam high schools are fully accredited; the teachers are certified and the system has graduated many outstanding doctors, lawyers, and educators who serve here as well as on Guam. This must be important to understand.

But the Department of Defense all along, while telling me that they may

establish schools in the fall of 1998, have continued to pursue this and surprised the entire island by announcing that schools would be established this fall, in October of 1997.

They did all of this while failing to actively engage local leaders and education officials. They never talked to them. They let the contract become the mechanism of the discussion. The whole process is already symptomatic of a major breakdown between local military officials and the people of Guam.

Difficult times lie ahead, and this is exactly because of this move. This effort is hostile in nature. To my knowledge, this may be the first time that the Department of Defense has established domestic dependent schools contrary to the desires and warnings of local officials, local leaders, and the local community. This paves the road for very difficult times in the military-civilian relationship on Guam.

There is much more at stake here than the quality of education. This is a relationship issue. It is not just about schools; it is about military planning. It is more, even more than that. Our relationship is built upon people relating to other people, and the military will destroy this with their effort to divide our youth and to promote separate communities. Guam has to be seen as part of America by our fellow Americans.

This outrageous move by DOD is hostile in its nature, hostile towards the local community from whom it wishes to separate, hostile toward the schools, and hostile toward its outstanding professionals and toward a people who have heretofore welcomed the military to their homes, its families, and its lands.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD extraneous materials relating to this topic. These are letters by the current and former Speaker of the Guam Legislature. Speaker Unpingco characterizes the island's sentiments well. Former Speaker San Agustin outlines the history of civilian-military relations on this issue.

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER,
Agana, Guam, July 8, 1997.

Hon. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD, M.C.,
House of Representatives,
Agana, Guam.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN UNDERWOOD: I am compelled to write to you regarding the recent decision by the Department of Defense to open DOD schools on Guam. Without any consideration of the social ramifications this would have, DOD has opted to segregate this community and pull over 2,700 military dependent school children out of the local public school system. What kind of message is the Department of Defense trying to send to the people of Guam?

Attached is a copy of my letter to Rear Admiral Martin E. Janczak, Commander, U.S. Naval Forces Marianas, wherein I state my concern over this decision on the part of DOD. To summarize the letter, the plan to open DOD schools on U.S. soil sends a strong message to the people of Guam that we are nothing more than second-class citizens in the eyes of the United States.

I must convey to you the sentiments of this community. The opening of DOD schools

is just another sign of an ugly American attitude of treating Guam as a foreign country when it is convenient and treating it as a US possession when it suits its needs. This is no longer acceptable!

Most of all, opening DOD schools will revive racial tensions on the island. Simply put, this plan implies that white Americans are smarter than brown Chamorros. May I remind you that the 1954 Supreme Court decision in *Brown vs. Board of Education of Topeka*, Kansas ruled that racially segregated schools were unconstitutional because separate educational facilities are inherently unequal. After years of living harmoniously, the military will separate our children and pit them against each other. What good will come out of all this?

I urge you to review this situation which has a potential for disaster and find another alternative. Let's work together on this issue and not against each other. I look forward to your input regarding this matter of the utmost urgency.

Sincerely,

ANTONIO R. UNPINGCO.

JULY 15, 1997.

The Editor,
Pacific Daily News,
Agana, Guam.

I want to congratulate the Department of Defense establishment, principally the local Naval and Air Force command, for finally succeeding in their efforts to restore it's pre-World War II segregated educational policies on the island of Guam.

Since the liberation of Guam, the military commands have consistently pursued it's goal, and that is to have a segregated educational program for it's military dependents. I'm sure that there is enough historical documents that will reveal that at the immediate outset of World War II, a segregated school was indeed established, principally at the former Adelup school. During the Guerrero administration the Adelup school was gradually phased out and integrated with the Piti Elementary school and other local areas. Please note that the Piti Elementary School was located at the foot of Nimitz Hill, thereby accommodating military dependents living at Nimitz Hill and the people of the municipality of Piti.

Over the years, many accommodations were made for the military by locating schools either adjacent to or near military bases. Let me cite a few examples. (1) The Finegayan Elementary School was located directly across the NAVCOM station and near the FAA Housing Area to accommodate the military dependents residing at NAVCOM; (2) The Upi Elementary School was originally requested by the Anderson Air Force Base Command to be constructed "inside" the Anderson Air Force Base. Instead of consolidating and improving the Yigo Elementary School, a compromise was arrived. The compromise was to build the Upi Elementary School "right outside the fence" approximately 100 feet distance from the back gate of Anderson Air Force Base; (3) Truman Elementary School in Santa Rita. This site location in itself has an interesting historical sequence. It was decided to build this particular Truman Elementary School right next to the Apra Heights Housing Area and Naval Magazine Housing Area and also at the same time near the Santa Rita Village. It also was used as a "pawn" by the Navy's desire to build an ammunition wharf at Sella Bay. Fortunately Governor Camacho, during a meeting at the Pentagon (where I was present) prevailed on the DOD officials to release the school site and permit us to build the Truman Elementary School; and gave up their demand for the location of the ammunition wharf at Sella Bay. Indeed,

this was rather unfortunate, in that the military tried to persuade GovGuam officials to agree to the Sella Bay ammunition wharf location in order for the Navy to release the school site designated as Truman Elementary School.

Government documents will also reveal that the Department of Defense, pursuant to Public Law 874, "the School Impact Aid", has been consistently "falling short in compliance" for full educational impact reimbursements. I'm sure former Speaker Franklin Quitugua will remember that he tried very hard, unsuccessfully, to seek full reimbursement from the federal government for military educational impact efforts under Public Law 874 for the last 25 years! The Federal government, having been delinquent for full reimbursement entitlements under this Public Law 874, the Ada Administration was persuaded to adopt an alternative source of financing that is the now so-called DoD Funds in lieu of the impact Aid funding under Public Law 874. This single action in itself truly paved the way for DoD to dictate as a "supplement" to local funding sources for education. Under Public Law 874, the funding, which comes under the purview of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, is part of the overall basic budget cost to finance the entire educational system. The simple action under the Ada-DoD Funding Contract, gave the DoD the "unusual authority" to either withhold or release such funds under it's military terms, thereby DoD finally establishing educational standards for the local educational system.

Having established this position of financial strength, the DoD, then actively pursued it's original intention to "establish it's own segregated school" which they could not do for over 50 years since 1946.

In addition to the above, the local educational system was federally mandated under the Organic Act of Guam to educate all school children on Guam, regardless of their origin, principally local, military and from our neighboring islands. And I now wonder, if the DoD impetus, having achieved a financial strength of dictating it's educational funding, with a school population significantly divided into 3 basic groups, that is the local, Micronesians, and the military dependents, provided the resulting environment.

AMERICA'S FOREIGN POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PAUL] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, it is currently an accepted cliché to say foreign policy is a Presidential matter and Congress should not meddle. Frequently we hear the pleading to remain bipartisan with no dissent, especially when troops are placed in harm's way. Yet no place in the Constitution do we find any such explicit instruction. Instead, we find no mention of foreign policy.

To the contrary, we find strict prohibitions placed on the President when it comes to dealing with foreign nations.

The Constitution is clear. No treaties can be entered into without the consent of the Senate. No war may be fought without the declaration of war by the Congress.

No money shall be spent overseas without Congress first raising the

money and then authorizing it and appropriating these funds for specific purposes.

Since the Constitution does not even assume a standing army, let alone stationing troops in peacetime in over 100 countries, with CIA clandestine activities in even more, the current foreign policy that has evolved over the past 100 years would surely be unrecognizable by the authors of that document.

The founders of this country were opposed to standing armies for fear they would be carelessly used. They were right.

The U.S. record of foreign intervention and its failures have not yet prompted a serious discussion of the need for an overall reassessment of this dangerous and out-of-control policy. Not only has Congress failed in its responsibilities to restrain our adventurous Presidents in pursuing war, spying, and imposing America's will on other nations by installing leaders and at times eliminating others throughout the world these past 50 years, we now, by default, have allowed our foreign policy to be commandeered by international bodies like NATO and the United Nations nations. This can only lead to trouble for the United States and further threaten our liberties, and we have already seen plenty of that in this century.

It looks like our current President, who was less than excited about serving in the military himself, was quite eager to promote U.S. complicity in the escalating dangerous activity in Bosnia. What has been done so frequently in the name of peace more often than not has led to war and suffering, considering Korea, Vietnam, Somalia, and even the Persian Gulf war.

Clinton has not been willing to phase out the Selective Service Department and has actually asked for additional funding to include the Selective Service process in his domestic so-called voluntary AmeriCorps program.

But this failed policy of foreign intervention is being pursued once again in Bosnia with full acknowledgment and funding by the Congress. Congress has failed to exert its veto over this dangerous game our President is determined to play in this region.

Sensing that maybe soon the Congress will finally cut the purse strings on this ill-advised military operation, pushed hard by Secretary of State Albright, policymakers are quietly and aggressively escalating the tension, placing our nearly 8,000 troops in even greater danger while further destabilizing a region never prone to be stable over this century, with the certain outcome that Congress will further capitulate and provide funding for extension and escalation of the military operation.

In spite of some resistance in the Congress, the current escalation is likely to prevent any chance of withdrawal of our troops by next summer.

The recent \$2 billion additional funds in the supplemental appropriation bill