

partner of Goldman Sachs, Robert Rubin, as U.S. Treasury Secretary.”

We have witnessed some rather disturbing policy stratagems in just, say the last 10 months or so. Greenspan's Fed began around August and September of last year to expand the money supply, the Adjusted Monetary Base, from around \$500 billion to nearly \$625 billion, a \$70 billion runup, in anticipation of potential Y2K effects. This enormous expansion flowed directly into financial markets and helped create the enormous boom in stock prices prior to that year's end. The speculation was seen primarily in high-tech stocks.

Then comes the sudden and nearly precisely the same spike downward of the same Adjusted Monetary Base right after the year ends and year 2000 begins. There are no problems with Y2K. This spike downward lasted until about April of the year 2000. We know the savage corrections the stock market displayed, and there were more losers than winners. All we ever hear about are the winners, not the thousands or millions of losers.

And why do we hear so little about the losers in the media? Because, so the argument goes, the market returned almost to normal. The market bounced back, so the argument goes. Certainly, as the Fed began once again to pump up the monetary base around April. But the losers remain losers, and lost homes, businesses and bankruptcies continue to reach all-time highs; personal debt, especially credit card debt and equity finance debt, have reached unheard of levels. This is the speculation? No, let us call it what it really is: Gambling. This is the gambling that is today our U.S. stock market.

We will not hear the White House complain. Only praise for Clinton's appointee shall be sounding out, ringing out the bell in praise for White House management of the economy. We will not hear that from the very speculative bubble created during the last 6 months of 1999. We will not hear that from the quickest investors, who took their profits before the inevitable downturn and before the corrections came.

Investors paid handsomely for their gains in capital gains taxes levied. It is no surprise to Fed watchers that the taxes collected from capital gains nearly equaled the much-hailed government surplus, which Clinton soberly explained was due to his wise leadership of the economy. If the surplus was really generated by the wise leadership of the White House, why has the government's debt not been going down? And we should not confuse the government debt with some mythical balanced budget.

For a Federal central bank, the concentration of power at the top is very marked. True, although the Board of Governors sets the discount rate and reserve requirements, the execution of monetary policy on an ongoing basis is

decided by the larger 12-member Federal Open Market Committee. But the FMOC brings only five voting Reserve Bank presidents, to which the New York bank is always one, leaving the Washington governors in the majority. And the influence of the chairman alone can be sometimes near to overwhelming.

On an historical note, and I taught history and government, so forgive me, Congress insisted on scattering 12 Federal Reserve banks across the country when the system was devised so the east could not restrict credit elsewhere. Interestingly, these regional Feds were chartered as private institutions in which local banks owned all the stock. That is still true today, with the outside directors on the board of a Federal Reserve a mix of representatives from small and large member banks in the district, as well as representatives from industry, commerce and the public.

What was intended here was a sort of balancing; three bankers with six nonbankers on each Federal Reserve Board. Supposedly, this would put the lenders at a disadvantage to the borrowing classes, which would outnumber the lenders six to three. The boards choose the Federal Reserve Bank presidents, always from the lending class, but do so only with the approval of the seven-member Federal Reserve Board in Washington. Thus, we can readily see that bankers, lenders, clearly dominate the Federal Reserve System itself.

Even though at the regional Feds the distinction I just made is superficially valid, many of the nonbank directors are tied inextricably to banking itself, or sit on separate boards of directors where bankers rest as well. Nor is the public sector category so clear. Many nonindustry participants on these boards have close ties to banking and banking's network of consultants, academics and financial management roles clearly bank related.

Just how much power any one regional president has is still debated in inner circles. Previous efforts at restricting Reserve Bank presidents' powers have been dismissed on the grounds that their powers were a proper delegation of authority by Congress. Allowing that the Federal Reserve is a quasi-government agency, it remains the only government agency in which private individuals, along with government-appointed individuals, together make government policy.

I will repeat that. The only government agency in which private individuals, along with government-appointed individuals, together make government policy.

It remains a solid fact that these regional bank presidents cast extremely important votes on public policies that in the present as well as the future affect the economic lives of every American.

□ 2030

Yet, and this is the point to my digression, they lack the public account-

ability because they lack the public legitimacy to be making these decisions, especially these kinds of decisions, some of whose recent effects I have just pointed out.

Nobody can deny any longer that the Federal Reserve system dominates the U.S. economy, that its decisions, more than even so-called market forces, a sham notion under managed competition in any case, affect everybody's lives and well-being, that within the decision-making process delegated to the Federal Reserve, the Board of Governors clearly dominates the process, that within that Board of Governors, the chairman, and this is not intended to single out Mr. Greenspan but to apply to all past and present and future chairmen, that the chairman dominates the board.

If all this does not concern this Congress, then history will record the result.

□

TRIBUTE TO VETERANS OF PACIFIC THEATER IN WORLD WAR II

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUNTER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity for a one-hour special order to pay homage to the veterans of the Pacific Theater during World War II and especially for those who participated in the battles for Guam and Saipan as part of a conflagration sometimes referred to as the Marianas Turkey Shoot, one of the greatest naval victories during World War II.

On July 21, at the end of this week, the people of Guam will be celebrating the liberation of Guam. It is the day that commemorates the landing of the Third Marine Division on the shores of Asan and the First Marine Provisional Brigade supported by the 77th Army Infantry in Agat.

I want to send my greetings to the veterans of that conflict as well as to draw and honor and pay respect to not only the U.S. forces who liberated Guam from Japanese occupiers but also to remember the people of Guam and the suffering that they endured during the Japanese occupation.

Japanese troops had earlier bombed and invaded Guam on December 8 and 10, 1941, as part of Japan's attacks on U.S. forces in the Pacific, including the attack, of course, on Pearl Harbor and on the Philippines, both areas having also significant U.S. forces.

This commemoration, which I do annually and which is marked by a laying of the wreath at the Tomb of the Unknowns, which I did last week, will honor the American veterans and remember the sacrifices of the people of Guam and will serve as a tribute for the necessity for peace. For it is only in the remembrance of the horrors of

war do we really truly remain vigilant in our quest for peace.

My purpose this evening is to give an historical perspective to the events we are commemorating on Guam and to enhance the understanding of people across the Nation of the wartime experience of the people of Guam and the post-war legacy which has framed the relationship of my island to the rest of the United States. It is a story that is a microcosm of the heroism of the soldiers everywhere and the suffering of civilians in occupied areas during World War II.

But, as is sometimes not understood about Guam, Guam is a unique story all to itself and it is an experience of dignity in the midst of political and wartime machinations of larger powers over small peoples and, as well, as a story of loyalty to America, a demonstration of loyalty that has not been asked of any civilian community during the entire 20th century.

Guam, which had been an American territory since the end of the Spanish-American War in 1898, was invaded in the early morning hours of December 10, 1941. Thus began a 32-month epic struggle of the indigenous people of Guam, the Chamorro people, to maintain their dignity and to survive during an occupation by a brutal oppressor.

In the months leading up to the war in the Pacific, American military planners had decided that it was not feasible to defend Guam against possible invasion forces by Japanese forces in the surrounding areas. All of the areas in Micronesia, save for Guam, were in the hands of the Japanese under a League of Nations mandate and the most significant Japanese installations being held in Saipan a hundred miles to the north and the naval forces in the Truc Lagoon some 350 miles to the south.

This decision was made because the war plans up to that time had called for several fixed fortifications on Guam that required congressional appropriations; and, unfortunately, due to rapidly moving events in the Pacific and tight military budgets, Guam did not receive the necessary funds to build any defenses in anticipation of World War II, a conflagration which everyone in the Pacific expected to occur at some time.

When the Japanese landed, they found 153 Marines, 271 naval personnel, and 134 workers associated with the Pan American clipper station and some 20,000 Chamorros who were at that time under a status called United States nationals. All American military dependents had been evacuated from Guam in anticipation of the war, with the last ship having left on October 17, 1941, pursuant to an order of the Naval Governor Captain McMillan.

The other vulnerable territory, the Aleutian Islands in Alaska, were similarly threatened by their proximity to Japanese forces. However, in that instance, the army evacuated all of the civilians off of the Aleutian inhab-

itants in anticipation of the Japanese invasion, thus sparing the people of the Aleutian Islands enemy occupation. So that it ended up that the Chamorros, the U.S. nationals in Guam, were alone among American civilian communities to withstand the onslaught of an enemy occupation.

To demonstrate how Chamorros were treated distinctively, a handful of Chamorros from Guam who worked at the Pan American station in Wake Island were not evacuated. They were civilians, and these were people working for Pan American clipper station in Wake Island. They were not evacuated. Whereas, their counterparts, American U.S. citizens civilians, were.

The end result was that this handful of Chamorro civilian and construction workers ended up fighting like Marines in the battle for Wake Island, and many of them died and were placed in prison camps. And after a long campaign, we were able to provide those Wake Island defenders with the benefits of veteran status as a result of their battle efforts at Wake Island during World War II.

For the actual defense of Guam, it fell to the Guam Insular Guard and the Guam militia comprised of civilian reserve forces, along with a handful of Marines and sailors. The Japanese invasion force, numbering some 5,000, easily overwhelmed the American defenders. And ironically, the only ones who really fired any shots in anger with the Japanese were members of the Guam Insular Guard, who had set up a couple of machine gun nests in defense of the plaza and the governor's offices.

The signal that the Japanese had used to indicate that they had now taken over the island was to lay an American flag on the grounds of the plaza. This was early in the morning, so the sun had not fully risen, and to flash flashlights over it to signal aircraft overhead.

Throughout the ordeal of the occupation, the Chamorro people maintained their loyalty to America and their faith that American forces would soon return to liberate them. The resistance against the occupation manifested itself in many, many forms but none so powerful and costly as the effort to help American servicemen who had decided not to surrender.

Along with their other fellow servicemen, seven U.S. sailors decided not to surrender and they were captured one by one. Each in turn was hunted down and killed by the Japanese occupiers.

One fortunate sailor evaded capture throughout the entire 32 months of occupation with the assistance of the people at the cost of numerous beatings and even beheadings. The story of this one sailor, George Tweed, was made into a movie entitled *No Man Is an Island*.

The actual liberation of Guam began on July 21, 1944, and was preceded by a serious bombardment which began in mid June. This was a time when they thought the invasion of Guam was

going to be an immediate follow-up to the invasion of Saipan in June of 1944.

After they began their preinvasion bombardment of the coast of Guam, they were called back only 2 hours after the initiation of the bombardment because of the ferocity of the battle for Saipan. So the invasion was actually called off for a period of about 5 weeks.

During the intervening 5 weeks following the original naval attack, the onslaught of cruelty endured by the Chamorros on Guam from their occupiers was incessant. This gave actually 5 weeks for Japanese forces to reinforce their position in full anticipation and, of course, gave them additional opportunity to mass the people on one side of the island. This increased brutality and intensity of the atrocities and marked the beginning of the end of the 2½ year enemy occupation.

The invasion, dubbed Operation Forager was schedule for July 21 and was preceded by a preinvasion bombardment lasting 13 days.

Now, my colleagues have to understand that this was an island 212 square miles, had a preinvasion bombardment lasting 13 days in large measure due to the experience of the battle of Saipan and the invasion of Normandy, there was a lot of rethinking about the nature of preinvasion bombardment.

While this bombardment level most fortified structures in Guam, it also acted as a stimulus for further atrocities against the people of Guam. And as the bombardment continued, the Chamorros became more restless and the Japanese, realizing their ensuing fate, inflicted further brutality and mass slaughter against my people.

The preinvasion bombardment had been preceded by numerous air raids beginning in February 1944, 5 months earlier. After the bombardment, underwater demolition teams, UDT teams, spent 4 days sweeping the shoreline, making the marine invasion possible. It is maybe perhaps an apocryphal story, but the Navy, the UDT, put a sign on Asan on the shore of Guam saying "Welcome U.S. Marines" signed "U.S. Navy."

The U.S. Marines landed on the narrow beaches of Asan and Agat to crawl up their way to what is now known as Nimitz Hill. The men of the Third Marine Division were thrust wave after wave onto Asan Beach, already littered with Marines that had come before them. And once on the shore, the U.S. troops were in the heart of Japan's defense fortifications.

This well-thought-out plan led to the heart of Japan's defense fortifications and into the heart of the defense fortifications climbing steep ridges.

I had the pleasure of meeting Mr. William Rose, who came to our wreath laying in honor of the liberation of Guam last week, and he was a participant in this as a 16-year-old Marine. He was in an advanced team of Marines and he had lied his way into the Marine Corps. He had joined at the age of 14;

and he went on to participate in Tarawa, Guam, and Iwo Jima, all as a 16-year-old.

Simultaneously, the southern beaches of Guam were being braved by the First Marine Brigade. However, this less formidable, it is a lot flatter area, was quickly interrupted by the only Japanese counter attack of the day. It is also in those beaches that former Senator Hal Heflin was wounded as a Marine in Guam.

The people of Guam are a resolute and tenacious people, as was proved over 56 years ago as they fought side by side with the Marine Corps participating as scouts, lookouts, and even forming little pockets of armed resistance to Japanese occupiers.

The liberation of Guam is commemorated as a time of solemn memory and remembrance every year since World War II, because it is this special struggle of Americans liberating what must be seen as fellow Americans that serves as a reminder of the spirit of freedom and the high cost that must be paid to maintain it.

□ 2045

The Chamorro people suffered severe privations and cruel injustices under the 3-year occupation by the Japanese where hundreds lost their lives. Thus the mutual and sacrificial experience of Guam's liberation holds unique distinction in the hearts and souls of both the Marines and the soldiers of the 77th infantry, and their story is the story of liberators from without and liberators from within. One came down from the mountain while the others came from the shore and some came from places called Dededo and Agat and others, the ones coming in from the ocean, came from places like Brooklyn and Des Moines. This special kind of spirit in the liberation of Guam which was not seen in any other battle during World War II was very obvious in the 50th anniversary of the liberation of Guam in 1994 when so many thousands of veterans came back, still very tearful, still very appreciative and still very understanding of the unique nature of this battle.

The importance of this particular battle for the war was very important to winning the war against Japan. The defeat of the forces on Saipan and Guam led to the fall of the Tojo government and the recognition in Japan that there was no doubt left about the outcome of the conflict with the United States. "Hell is upon us," stated Admiral Nagano, supreme naval adviser to the Japanese Emperor, and indeed it was as the Marianas was used as the primary location for bombers to take off from airfields on Guam, Saipan and Tinian, Harmon, Andersen, North, Northwest Field, Isley Field, Kobler Field and other names, very familiar to the men of the Army Air Corps, including one of our own distinguished members here in the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), who participated in many

bombing raids flying out of Guam, flying out of what was then North Field and now what is called Andersen Air Force Base.

The importance of the Marianas as the islands from which to prosecute not only an air war against Japan but as the jumping off points for further landings in the Philippines and Okinawa and Iwo Jima became crucial to final victory. In effect, Apra Harbor on Guam became the forward naval base as Pearl Harbor was effectively moved 3,500 miles to the west. And in the words of the victory at sea treatment of the battle for Guam, it is said that Guam became the supermarket of the Pacific struggle after the recapture in July of 1944.

From Guam, Admiral Nimitz set up his headquarters for the balance of the war. In the island-hopping strategy of the Pacific, the Marianas Islands were not to be leapfrogged since they were an integral part of Japan's defensive structure. The ferocity of the Marianas campaign was an indication of the blood that was to be shed in later campaigns. On Saipan, the Americans encountered a phenomenon that had never been encountered before but they would subsequently see in greater and greater numbers, the site of hundreds of Japanese soldiers and civilians committing suicide by jumping off of cliffs rather than surrendering. At places that are now called Suicide Cliff and Banzai Cliff on Saipan, American soldiers and Marines could only watch helplessly as civilian noncombatants chose death over surrendering to an enemy that they believed would commit atrocities against them. And while sporadic kamikaze raids had been encountered in some air battles, naval air battles, nothing could compare to the mass suicides that stunned the American forces.

All of these factors weighed into the decision to avoid an invasion of Japan and the eventual use of atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Again as we all know the Marianas played a pivotal role in providing the airfield in Tinian where the bombers loaded with the world's first atomic bombs were launched.

As I have indicated before, there is a special dimension to the battle for Guam which was not present in any other Pacific battle, indeed, any other battle during World War II. If you look at it historically, Guam was the only U.S. territory inhabited by civilians that had been invaded and occupied by an enemy power since the war of 1812.

This special relationship between the liberated and the liberators, the people who suffered and endured and the people who remained loyal and the people who came to liberate them and free them from their occupiers is really reflected in this very, very special portrait. This is a painting of a picture taken by a serviceman who stumbled onto two young Chamorro boys and liberated them and these two young Chamorro boys have two flags that are

basically replicas of what they think an American flag should look like. It was clear that when the servicemen first saw this and they first had the experience of this, it was reported that many battle-hardened American servicemen broke down at the sight of these people and sobbed at the sight of the children with the handmade American flags, imperfect in their design yet perfectly clear in what they were representing. This was these boys' presentation of that same flag which had earlier laid on the ground in Guam and which the Japanese commander waved the flashlight over as a sign of victory.

The people of Guam had endured much during the occupation of their island. There was forced labor, particularly in the last few months as the Japanese hurriedly built defense fortifications and air strips on the labor of men and boys as young and 13 and 14. There was confiscation of food to feed the thousands of Japanese soldiers brought in from Manchuria as garrisoned troops to fight off the invasion. This led to some form of malnutrition affecting all of the population of Guam, especially the children. In a postwar study of the children of Guam, those who were born after the war were on the average two inches taller than those children who were born right at the beginning of the occupation or just before the occupation. Those who had grown to adolescence prior to the war were also taller than the children of the occupation.

And there was the forced marches and eventual internment in camps near places called Maimai and Manengon. Manengon was where most of the people went and Manengon today still is a testimony to that. It has a river running through it, has lots of bamboo, lots of coconut palms, it is a very heavily wooded area. As people were marched, many were shot or bayoneted or executed or beaten for moving too fast or too slow as whole families, young and old, made their way in ox carts and carabao, water buffalos and just on foot and carrying each other. And in the camps, the people stayed for weeks with no food, waiting for their deliverance and hoping that the Japanese would not carry out the threats to kill them all which of course were numerous and in many instances the Japanese did try to carry out some of these threats.

In this entire panorama of experience, there were naturally heroic stories and very dramatic tales. But most experienced the war as a time in which their families were put at risk. My parents lost three children during the war. Two were buried in areas that my mother can remember but which we cannot really find today. My elder brothers and sisters became so ill. One was so malnourished, the stomach walls almost became transparent. I am the only child in my family that was born after World War II. For most people, this was a very typical experience, a very common experience. For most Chamorros, the war challenged them in these very direct ways.

There is an element to this story which does have a legislative end to it and which needs some resolution to it. A lot has been said about the sacrifices made by U.S. citizens and our allies during the war in the Pacific, World War II. The story that I just told about the people of Guam has not really been fully understood in the context of how, what do you do with the experiences of these people. The people of Guam at the time of the Japanese occupation were not U.S. citizens. They were in a category of people called U.S. nationals. That is to say, they were in political limbo, fully anticipating that one day they would become U.S. citizens. Because they were in this particular situation, in 1948 the U.S. Congress passed a law that compensated U.S. citizens for their experience during World War II, including forced labor and internment. The people of Guam were not included in that legislation because, A, they were not U.S. citizens at the time and there was a bill that Congress had passed in 1945 designed to give them property compensation but not compensation for the trials and tribulations. The way the law that was passed for Guam worked was that if you wanted to make a claim beyond \$5,000, you had to personally come to Washington, D.C. and present your claim to a Navy committee with some congressional involvement. Of course, in 1945 most people on Guam were simply trying to piece their lives together, so not much happened. So what happened with most people in Guam is that the Navy officials who were adjudicating these claims on Guam would simply offer a dollar amount for an injury. In one instance, a real life example, a gentleman got \$90 compensation for loss of his thumb. Another family got \$300 compensation for loss of their father. When the 1948 law was passed, it offered, of course, a whole range of different options and an unending time period in which to resolve these claims that would arise out of the activities of the Japanese government. At the time the theory was that the U.S. Government had confiscated much Japanese property, had frozen all Japanese assets. This was the pool of money through which people who suffered at the hands of the Japanese were going to be compensated. The people of Guam were not included in that legislation.

In 1950, the people of Guam were declared U.S. citizens. A few months later, Japan and the United States signed a peace treaty which then stated that U.S. citizens could not file claims against Japan for the experience of the war. It was kind of a hold harmless which is very common in peace treaties. So here we have a situation where in a very literal sense, the people of Guam fell through the cracks on this war reparations effort. Because they were not U.S. citizens, they were not included in the 1948 law. Two years later they were declared U.S. citizens, a few months later they were not allowed to submit claims against Japan

and they were still not included in the 1948 law. In 1962, this law was then re-amended in Congress, but at that time the people of Guam were still not included in the law. There was no representation of anyone from Guam in 1962 here in the House of Representatives. As a consequence, that effort did not include the people of Guam.

So what I have done is there is a piece of legislation which has the support of members of the Committee on the Judiciary. I am proud to say that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) who is himself a veteran of the conflict in the Philippines fully understands and supports this effort. I am proud to say DANIEL INOUE over in the Senate has a companion measure which is basically identical to the measure which has been reported out of the Committee on Resources, which is to create a commission to study the claims of the people of Guam, those who still remain of the original 20,000 who survived the occupation, probably less than 6 or 7,000 remain today as living embodiments of that experience, to study the claims and for the commission to make recommendations regarding that.

I am hopeful that this legislation will see the light of day and that it will bring to light and bring honor and memory to the people who did suffer. Many names come to mind in this effort that we have undertaken and we have tried to move this legislation over many years. I cannot let this rest without again bringing honor to one individual in particular, a young lady at the time by the name of Beatrice Floris who later on married Mr. Emsley, Beatrice Floris Emsley who as a 13-year-old survived an attempted beheading by Japanese soldiers. They attempted to behead her. She felt a thump, she was dumped into a shallow grave, left for dead for 2 days, finally dug her way out, it was a shallow grave so she could still breathe, and for the next 3 days kind of wandered aimlessly until American soldiers discovered her.

□ 2100

The interesting thing about Mrs. Emsley, and she was a great woman, is that she never liked to talk about this experience. Of course, it was a very painful experience. There are not very many people who would survive an attempted beheading. And if any of us have ever seen stories of these atrocities, that was a favored method of execution, simply a big Samurai sword would come down and basically make a fatal cut in your neck, sometimes decapitating people right on the first stroke.

This young lady at the age of 13 did not like to talk about it. I remember when I was in high school I used to see her, and we would always say, did you get to see Mrs. Emsley's scar? Sometimes young people, not being as sensitive as they should be, would take note of it.

Mrs. Emsley proved to be the most courageous spokesperson for this gen-

eration of a very courageous people, because we would ask her to come to Congress to tell her story, and she would. She did so at great personal sacrifice and discomfort for herself, but her words were remarkably free of any bitterness.

She never said anything that could be considered unkind. She never said a hostile word. She only recounted the experience and the brutality of the war and then made a special plea for recognition of the Chamorro people of Quam.

The very first piece of legislation that I was able to pass as a Member of this body, and I did so with the assistance of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO), at that time who was chair of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, to him I owe a great debt for helping me with this, and Mrs. Emsley, was to construct a memorial wall of the war in the Pacific National Park.

There is only one national park that is devoted to the attention to the war on the Pacific, and that happens to be in Quam. We did build a memorial wall listing all of the people, the soldiers and the Marines and servicemen, who died in the Liberation of Quam and the People of Quam who died and were injured and who were subjected to force labor interment.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, Mrs. Emsley has since passed away. I cannot let any commemoration of the Liberation of Quam pass without drawing special attention to her courage and her dedication and her genuine humanity.

Today, as we try to resolve these issues, it brings attention that Quam has a very important role, not only in World War II, but also today. And as Quam's Representative here in the House of Representatives, as a Member of the House Committee on Armed Services, I have frequently maintained and tell the message that the Euro-centric focus, much of our attention, not only economically but sometimes in terms of strategic vision, is an anachronistic vestige of a by-gone-era.

We often heard the cliché that the last 100 years was known as the American Century, and that the next 100 years will be known as the Pacific Century. After World War II, America's Asian presence was relegated to bases in Japan and the Philippines and the Pacific Islands.

All of these things have happened since then, the Cold War and Quam's vital part in the Cold War, and also its part as a staging area again for the Korean conflict, as a major B-52 base for the Vietnam conflict, as a very important part of the network of basing and forward presence of the United States in Asia and being a part of the Cold War struggle; now we are beyond the Cold War, but the importance of Quam has, nevertheless, taken on new dimensions as we try to figure out what we are going to do in that part of the world.

Quam is the only American territory on the other side of the dateline that

has a \$10 billion military infrastructure. It is the only place where American forces can operate with complete freedom and mobility without having to consult local authorities or foreign countries. It is the place which demonstrates and which continues to demonstrate that America is a Pacific power and an Asian power.

As we contemplate what we are going to do in the 21st Century, and as we determine what is going to be our strategy on strategic vision in the 21st Century, and it would be, I think, simplistic to simply say that China has somehow replaced the Soviet Union, but we certainly need to consider what the challenge of China means to us as we consider all of those elements and all of the areas that could go wrong, that could provide serious involvement of American forces, whether it is things going wrong in Southeast Asia, as we look at what is going on in Indonesia, and the problems with the rebels in the Philippines and the disputes over the Spratlys or the issues that are pertaining to Taiwan and China, or the possibility of a Korean conflict on the Korean Peninsula, which hopefully will dissipate over time; all of that has Quam as a very important part of it.

Even in a more peaceful scenario in the Pacific, if we pull out of Quam, if we pull back from Quam, we are really going to pull out of the eastern hemisphere. We are really going to have to pull back all the way to Hawaii, and that would basically mean that the United States is no longer an Asian power.

In the early part of the 1990s, there was a lot of knee-jerking, I believe, in the military that tended to deemphasize the importance of Quam. The military until recently not only dramatically reduced their presence on Quam, but closed down a ship repair facility, forced thousands of loyal civil service workers to leave the island through very ill-advised commercial outsourcing studies. In order to balance this, we are happy to see that there is a new emphasis on East Asia.

We on Quam recognize that we live in a very important neighborhood where global stability and economic growth will hinge upon the delicate regional interplay of security, trade and the peaceful resolution of grievances.

The Pentagon's reexamination of the role of Quam within this is refreshing and prudent and necessary. What remains to be seen, however, is whether this renewed look will result in renewed commitment, and that is through budgetary support and concrete action. In any case, the people of Quam stand ready to join the military in a renewed partnership.

July 21, the end of this week, will mark the 56th anniversary of the Liberation of Quam. In Quam, this is the single biggest holiday. Its recognition of the unique nature of the history of the island, commemorating not just the fact that the Marines and the soldiers conducted themselves in a heroic

way to defeat what was ultimately a brutal, oppressive enemy, but it is also a commemoration of the fact that the Chamorro people were tested severely; they not only survived, but they proved that they could thrive under the most difficult circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, in that interplay between the Chamorro capacity to survive and the Chamorro capacity to deal with adversity and the fact that the Americans did come back and the fact that the Chamorro people were themselves Americans, it is in that interplay that makes this particular commemoration, I think, unique amongst all the other commemorations of World War II and why it continues to have a very powerful hold upon the people of Quam.

If one can understand the scene of Quam as in Washington, D.C. or anyplace else here, it is seen as a very isolated community, a very insulated community. All of my days as a child, I looked forward to Liberation Day. We had a great parade. We would see lots of recreations of the war experience. We would see a lot of military people parade up and down. We would see a lot of community floats, and there would just be a lot of spirit of contentment and commemoration mixed with happiness and laughing and also some serious reflection upon this.

We also had at that time the Island's only successful carnival, islandwide carnival. It would be what would be seen here as a county fair atmosphere. All of those things together really cemented our understanding of what it means to be American.

I have to say this with a very strong sense of pride in my people and the people that have brought me here to Washington, D.C. to represent them that they did something that is remarkable, is historical and stands as a great testimony to their potential, their loyalty, their devotion to duty and their commitment and their capacity to survive. As we deal with legislation here in the House, or as we deal with what sometimes appears to be very mundane matters, when compared to the kinds of sacrifices and tribulations that we pay homage to, at a time when we reflect upon great conflagrations like World War II, it really is with a sense of awe and a sense of deep satisfaction that I am able to represent them.

Later on this week, ironically, there will be a time to review the World War II memorial, which will be built here on the Mall. There is some level of controversy as to whether to build a memorial to World War II. There is some people who are saying that it is an intrusion on the Mall between the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial, and that somehow or another this will somehow change the nature of that.

It is hard to believe and it is hard to imagine that there will be people actually opposed to a World War II memorial, only someone who is totally out of

touch with historical reality would fail to understand what World War II means to the lives of everyone alive today in the world.

I do want to point out that there was a particular dimension of the memorial, which was envisioned when the very first memorial was proposed for World War II, it had 50 pillars. I inquired of the people that were building the memorial. I said what did the 50 pillars stand for? They said they stand for each of the 50 States, and this is how we are going to commemorate World War II. I said where is the pillar for Quam? They said that is not a State. It is not part of the thinking that went into it.

I was incredulous, because given just the remarkable story that I have told about the unique circumstance of the battle for Quam and the occupation and then the return of the Americans to Quam and all the unique Americans liberating, in effect, other Americans, that that story for this memorial was now not going to be included. So there proceeded a series of discussions over time.

I pointed out to them your memorial is historically inaccurate. There were only 48 States at the time of World War II. So what does that mean for Alaska and Hawaii? You said you are not honoring territories, but Alaska and Hawaii were territories at the time.

So after a series of discussions, we have now settled on 56 pillars. I am very happy to report that at least we had a little bit of a victory in getting people to understand the true impact of World War II and the true dimension of all the contributions of all of those people who live under the flag and who participated in a very direct way in World War II.

□

□ 2115

COLORADO AND ITS NATIONAL PARKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, tonight I want to talk about a number of subjects but before I do, first of all, I want to address the preceding speaker, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD). I thought his comments were excellent.

I would like to note that my father, who now lives in Glenwood Springs, Colorado, fought off Guam when he was 18 or 19 years old, and we are proud of him for that. Three times a week, I guess, they would fly off to bomb Japan. He is one who I wish I would have known the gentleman was making his comments this evening. I would have had my father tune in. He would have enjoyed the gentleman's comments.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?