

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 I'm sure that there is enough historical documents that will reveal that at the immediate outset of World War II, a segregated school was indeed established, principally at the former Adelup school.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

was the cue to the President that the Congress will not act to stop the operation when under pressure to support the troops. Of course, common sense will tell us that the best way to support our troops is to bring them home as quickly as possible. This idea, that support for the troops once they are engaged means we must continue the operation no matter how ill-advised and perpetuate a conflict that makes no sense, but that is what President Clinton is depending on.

Last week the whole operation in Bosnia changed. The arrest and killing of war criminals by occupation forces coming from thousands of miles away is a most serious escalation of the Bosnia conflict. For outside forces to pronounce judgment on the guilt or innocence of warring factions in a small region of the world is a guarantee that the conflict will escalate. I think those pursuing this policy know this. Prosecuting war criminals is so fraught with danger it seems the need to escalate surpassed all reason.

Yet immediately after the NATO operation, supported by the United States, that resulted in the death of a Serb leader, Clinton strongly suggested that the troops may well not be able to leave in June of 1998 as promised. They were first supposed to leave in December of 1996, and now 18 months after their arrival, the departure date is indefinite, and we in the Congress tragically continue to fund the operation.

This illegal and dangerous military operation will not go unnoticed and will embolden the Serbs and further stir the hatred of the region. Is this policy based on stupidity or is there a sinister motive behind what our world leaders do?

Must we have perpetual war to keep the military appropriations flowing? Does our military work hand in glove in securing new markets? It is not a hidden fact that our own CIA follows our international corporate interests around the globe engaging in corporate espionage and installing dictators when they serve these special interests.

Why would an Air Force plane, with a dozen leading industrialists, be flying into a war-torn region like Bosnia, along with the Secretary of Commerce? I doubt they were on a humanitarian mission to feed the poor and house the homeless.

The lobbyists who pushed the hardest to send troops to Bosnia came from corporations who are now reaping great profits from construction work in Bosnia. It may be the calculation is for a slight escalation of the conflict—that inevitably will accompany any attempt to try war criminals—and no one plans for another great war breaking out in this region.

What might be planned is just enough conflict to keep the appropriations coming. But the possibility of miscalculation is very real. The history of this region should surely warn us of the dangers that lurk around the corner.

We, in the Congress, have a great responsibility in reversing this policy. We must once again assume this responsibility in formulating foreign policy and not acquiesce to the Presi-

dent's pressure to perpetuate a serious misdirected policy of foreign meddling 4,000 miles away from home. We must not fall for the old line that we cannot leave, because to do so, we would not be patriotically "supporting our troops." That is blatant nonsense.

We have already invested \$7.7 billion in this ill-advised military adventure. That money should have either remained in the pockets of working Americans or spent here in the United States.

The New York Times has praised this recent action by Clinton and the NATO forces and has called for more of the same. The New York Times and the Washington Post also support the notion that our troops will have to stay in this region for a lot longer than the middle of next year.

The military industrial complex and its powerful political supporters continue to be well represented in the media and in Washington. Unfortunately, the idea that America is responsible to police the world and provide the funding and the backup military power to impose "peace" in all the disturbed regions of the world remains a policy endorsed by leaders in both parties.

The sooner this policy is challenged and changed, the better off we will be. Our budget will not permit it; it threatens our national security, and worst of all, it threatens our personal liberties.

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN RUSSIA

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

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, less than 2 weeks ago our Nation celebrated its Independence Day, a day in which all Americans celebrate the many freedoms that were fought to achieve. Several hundred years ago, a group of colonists chose to come across the Atlantic Ocean to settle in and explore a new continent. For many, a prime motivation was to flee from restrictions on their ability to express themselves religiously.

One of the freedoms that we as Americans are so fortunate to have is the ability to associate, organize, express and freely believe in the religion that we so choose.

In Russia, several provisions of a piece of legislation threaten the liberties of its citizens by restricting their freedom to express themselves religiously. It is the most extreme attack on the civil rights of the Russian people since the collapse of the Soviet Union. This new law would terminate and restrict the normal legal status of all religious organizations except those that were registered under the former Soviet Government. This action would result in thousands of churches and schools being forced to end their services, including many American and foreign organizations that have gone to Russia to provide humanitarian and medical assistance to those in need. Even those informal groups that meet

in someone's home could be under state control.

After making such tremendous progress in establishing a democratic system of government over the past few years, this action by the Russian Duma, or parliament, would clearly be a step backward for the Government of Russia.

The people of Russia have suffered and worked hard to achieve a system of government that would eventually give them the fruits of a truly free nation. While our Nation has no official religion and does not give preference to any religion, we recognize the important role that religious organizations have in the lives of our citizens. We can only hope and pray that the leaders of Russia will recognize the same.

This legislation is now sitting on President Boris Yeltsin's desk. I urge President Yeltsin and the leaders of the Russian Government to have the courage to stand up and protect the basic civil rights of Russia's people to express themselves freely and to worship as they so choose.

JUVENILE CRIME CONTROL ACT OF 1997

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

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address what I am seeing as an increasing number of ads and op-ed pieces that mischaracterize H.R. 3, the juvenile crime bill, which passed this body back in May and which is being deliberated in one version or another in the other body right now.

A number of op-eds have said lately things that just are not so. One of the myths is that H.R. 3 mandates that children as young as 13 must be prosecuted as adults and requires States to do the same. That is absolutely false. The juvenile crime bill, H.R. 3, that we passed includes a modest expansion of Federal law which already provides for discretionary prosecution of 13-year-olds. H.R. 3 does not require States to do the same.

Discretionary authority for Federal prosecution of 13-year-old juvenile offenders as adults for the most serious of crimes is nothing new. It became law in the 1994 crime bill through an amendment offered by Senator CAROL MOSELEY-BRAUN of Illinois, a Democrat. Moreover, H.R. 3 does not require States to have this same standard. H.R. 3 provides incentive grants to States to provide prosecutors the option of prosecuting as adults those juveniles who are 15 and older and who have committed murder, rape, or assault with a firearm.

Most States already provide for this option. We wanted to make certain, if they were going to get Federal moneys to improve their juvenile justice systems, that all States did this, and it