

TABLE 3. COMPARISON OF SERVICES/PROGRAMS AND ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS—SECTION 6 VS. DODDS—E—Continued

Full services provided	K-6—Camp Lejeune (aver. 398)	1-6—Dodds-E Schools (1-400)	K-6—Fort Bragg (aver. 496)	1-6—Dodds-E Schools (400-499)	K-6—Fort Campbell (aver. 720)	1-6—Dodds-E Schools (500-749)	1-6—Dodds-E Schools (over 750)
Art .....	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Music .....	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Physical Ed. (P.E.) .....	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Guidance counselor .....	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	1/600 kids	Yes
Reading improvement specialist .....	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Talented and gifted teacher .....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
English as a second language .....	No	1/40 kids (weighted)	Yes	1/40 kids (weighted)	Yes	1/40 kids (weighted)	1/40 kids (weighted)
Compensatory Ed. (Comp. Ed.) .....	Yes	1/70 kids in program	No	1/70 kids in program	No	1/70 kids in program	1/70 kids in program
Librarian .....	Yes	.5/126-348 in 1/349-999 kids	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
School nurse .....	Yes	.5/350-499 kids	Yes	.5/350-498 kids	Yes	Yes	Yes
Special education services (learned impaired, etc.)	Full range available	Authorized only in weighted numbers	Full range available	Authorized only in weighted numbers	Full range available	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )

\* Refer to Dodds-E MPWR Branch Staffing Standards, SY 95/96 for fuller explanations. Section 6 Schools surveyed: Camp Lejeune, NC; Fort Bragg, NC; Fort Campbell, KY. 61.5% of DODDS-E Schools have under 400 students enrolled. 11% of DODDS-E Schools have between 400-500 students enrolled. 17% of DODDS-E Schools have between 500-800 students enrolled. 10% of DODDS-E Schools have over 800 students enrolled.  
<sup>1</sup> Authorized only in weighted numbers.

Overseas, in DoDDS schools, the opposite occurs. This is shown in Table 1. Type and Size of DoDDS-E Schools, found in Appendix No. 4, Tables 4, 5, and 6 in conjunction with Table 1, show that:

for DoDDS elementary schools, a majority or 61.5% are in the range of under 400 student enrollment; for DoDDS unit schools (K-12), the majority or 58% are in the range of under 200 student enrollment; and,

for DoDDS high schools, the majority or 81% are in the range of under 500 student enrollment.

In particular, it should be noted that there are NO DoDDS high schools with more than 700 students, while U.S.-wide, over half of all American high schools have MORE than 1000 students.

The explanation for this phenomenon is quite simple. The bulk of the DoDDS-E schools are spread too far apart to allow for the consolidation that occurs in the United States. For example, in Turkey if the DoDDS schools there could be consolidated, it would make staffing easier. The distances of hundreds of miles which separate these schools prevent this. This is the rule in DoDDS, not the exception.

In effect, stateside schools can be visualized as an inverse pyramid, with the largest schools being the consolidated high schools, the smallest ones being the neighborhood elementary schools. It is clear that the sizes of the elementary schools in the United States are generally considerably larger than those in DoDDS. In the overseas schools however, the pyramid is bottom-heavy, positioned in its normal fashion, with most of the enrollment in elementary schools and a paucity of students in the age groups for upper grades (grades 7-12).

Overseas schools are often located at distances of 200 to 300 miles away from each other with no way to consolidate, which results in decreasing student populations as students move up through the grades.

If these smaller schools are staffed based purely and strictly upon enrollment requirements set forth in the Staffing Documents found in Appendix no. 1, can they offer the programs that are available in the sampled Section 6 Schools? Just because students are required to go to schools with smaller enrollments, is it appropriate that they have fewer educational opportunities than their state-side peers?

Certainly not. Parents, driven by perception and reality, who are required to bring dependents overseas to schools in these isolated areas will not be satisfied: They will refuse to enroll their children in schools that are not offering at least the same programs that are offered in the United States—in fact, the programs would have to be better to be a real inducement; word will spread that DoDDS is not providing quality education; the Quality of Life available will be degraded; military recruitment will suffer; and, there will be a resistance to overseas assignments.●

GLADYS MANSON HAUG ARNTZEN TURNS 100 YEARS OLD IN AUGUST

● Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, a very valued constituent of mine, E.P. "Pete" Paup, executive vice president of the Manson Construction and Engineering Co. in Seattle, WA, has brought to my attention that his mother-in-law will reach the age of 100 years on August 13, 1995. Pete has kindly shared with me the life story of this remarkable woman.

Gladys Angelica Christine Manson was born in the small community of Dockton on Maury Island in the young State of Washington, August 13, 1895. Her parents, Minnie Carlson Manson and Peter Manson, were Swedish immigrants who had moved to Dockton from Tacoma in 1893.

Peter was employed by the local dry-docking company and became dockmaster in 1903. The year before, 1902, little Gladys held a lantern when her mother dug up a glass jar full of \$20 gold pieces from a crawl space beneath their house. Because of the bank failures during the panic of 1893, the Mansons didn't trust their money to banks, so they hid it. The gold from the mason jar was used to purchase a steam donkey engine for a floating pile driver. Today, Manson Construction and Engineering Co. is a major Pacific coast marine construction and dredging contractor.

In 1910, Gladys was a member of Dockton Grade School's first graduating class, whereupon she entered Burton High School. In 1912 she moved to Seattle with her family and graduated from Lincoln High School in 1914. After graduation, Gladys entered the University of Washington and graduated in 1918 with a degree in music.

Gladys later taught music in Brooklyn, Seattle, and Roslyn, WA and spent 3 years as a district music supervisor in Kent, WA.

In 1924 she married Andrew J. Haug and had three children, Irving, Peter, and Andrea. Andrew Haug died in 1965. Later Gladys married Edward J. Arntzen, a retired professor from Western Washington University in Bellingham, WA. Edward passed away in 1971.

Gladys is an active member of Grace Lutheran Church in Bellevue, WA and is a member of the Lincoln High School Alumni Association. She has also been

a member of both the Sons of Norway and the Swedish Club.

Gladys Manson Haug Arntzen will celebrate her 100th birthday at her daughter's home, on August 13, 1995. I invite the attention of all my colleagues to this tremendous story and great community contribution, and in doing so, I wish Gladys Manson Haug Arntzen the happiest of birthday celebrations on August 13.●

APPOINTING SAM FOWLER, CHIEF COUNSEL FOR THE MINORITY, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

● Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, today I would like to formally announce that I have named Sam Fowler the chief counsel for the minority on the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. For several years Sam has been our counsel for the toughest issues and the person we turn to make sense of the most difficult assignments. I would like to recognize his importance to use with the title of chief counsel.

Sam follows in the footsteps of Mike Harvey, who has for two decades defined the role of chief counsel on this committee. Sam is cut from that same high quality cloth as Mike. I know that the committee's tradition of excellence in service to its members will be carried forward with Sam.

Sam is a graduate of the University of New Hampshire and the George Washington University Law School. He has served with the Smithsonian Institution, the Council on Environmental Quality, in private practice and with Mo Udall in the House of Representatives. Sam joined our staff in 1991. He has been invaluable, absolutely invaluable.

Sam's portfolio includes nuclear facility licensing, parliamentary procedure, the budget process, uranium enrichment, Russian reactor safety, cleanup of Department of Energy nuclear weapons production sites, alternative fuels, automobile fuel efficiency, low-level nuclear waste disposal, health effects of electromagnetic fields, the National Environmental Policy Act, constitution law, nominations, Government organization, Senate and committee standing rules and ethics issues. In addition, Sam can

take on anything else you can assign to him.

Sam is also our resident historian, defender of Thomas Jefferson, source of quotes that elucidate the wisdom of Winston Churchill and repository or precedents established in the Senate, the House of Representatives and the English Parliament. He is a partisan of good clear prose, a lover of poetry and our committee's best legislative draftsman. I cannot imagine the Energy and Natural Resources Committee without him. I am glad to call him my chief counsel. •

#### COMMEMORATION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF MACKINAC STATE PARK

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I rise today to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the founding of Mackinac Island State Park. From the island's beginnings as a fort fought over by the French, British, and Americans, to the peaceful calm of a historical vacation spot enjoyed by many, Mackinac Island State Park and the waters surrounding it are a rich and important part of our Nation's frontier and exploratory history.

Mackinac Island State Park became Michigan's first State park in 1895 after its transfer to the State from the Federal Government, ending its 20-year tenure as the Nation's second national park. The Mackinac Island State Park Commission was founded in 1895 to supervise the Mackinac Island State Park, including the 14 historic buildings comprising Fort Mackinac, which were built by the British Army in the late 18th century.

In 1904, the commission took on the administration of the site of Colonial Michilimackinac, established by the French in 1715 in Mackinac City and later dismantled and moved to Mackinac Island by the British. The area had been a fur-trade community, full of life and color. In 1975, the water-powered sawmill and 625-acre nature park known as Mill Creek were added to the land overseen by the commission. Mill Creek is located southeast of Mackinac City on the shore of Lake Huron. Over the years, the acquisition of land by the commission has led to a beautiful State park consisting of 1,800 acres and enjoyed by more than 800,000 visitors each year.

Mackinac Island State Park is dear to the hearts of many Michigan residents and visitors alike. The smell of Mackinac Island fudge brings childhood memories back to many a visitor while the clip-clop of horse hooves and the ring of bicycle bells on the automobile-free island recalls a by-gone time.

Mackinac Island State Park is a vital part of Michigan's history. It is home to the State's oldest known building still standing and the longest porch in the world, located at the opulent Grand Hotel. I know many people in Michigan and around the world will join me in

celebrating the jewel of the Great Lakes in the commemoration of its 100 spectacular years.

#### LOWER MILITARY SPENDING YIELDS HIGHER GROWTH

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I refer to my colleagues an article from the July 15 issue of *The Economist*. The article discusses the economic impact of reduced military spending in light of worldwide declines in defense budgets over the last decade. While the impact of such a peace dividend is difficult to calculate, the article brings up an interesting point:

In the long run, most economists think that lower defense spending should stimulate growth. One reason for this is that cash can be switched from defense to more productive areas such as education. A second is that smaller military budgets should lead to lower overall government spending, hence lower borrowing than would otherwise have been the case. As a result, interest rates should be lower, stimulating private investment.

The article also refers to a recent IMF study which finds a clear relationship between lower military spending and increased economic growth. It concludes that a 2-percent per capita rise in GDP will result from the decreased spending worldwide in the late 1980's. Its authors also estimate that if global military spending is reduced to 2 percent of GDP—the United States currently spends 3.9 percent—the dividend will eventually lead to a rise in GDP per head of 20 percent.

I bring this to light as we consider increasing military spending by \$7 billion, while making deep cuts in education, job training, health, and programs for the poor. Already, our Nation spends more on the military than the next eight largest militaries combined. It is a mistake to turn back against global trends to a course which, in the long run, will lead to lower growth and hurt our international competitiveness.

This Congress skewed priorities of spending more on the military and less on social investment will nullify the dividend we hope to reap through balancing the budget and lowering interest rates. Simply put, investment in a B-2 bomber creates a plane that sits there incurring operating costs, but investment in a child's education creates opportunity, productivity, and long-lasting benefits to society.

I ask that the article be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the *Economist*, July 15, 1995]

FEWER BANGS, MORE BUCKS—SINCE THE END OF THE COLD WAR, MILITARY SPENDING HAS DECLINED IN MOST COUNTRIES, YET THE PROMISED "PEACE DIVIDEND" IS PROVING ELUSIVE

Francis Fukuyama, an American political analyst, claimed in 1989 that the collapse of communism heralded the end of history. Few believed him, but many looked forward to the end of at least one aspect of the cold war: high defence spending. No longer would

countries waste precious resources building tanks and bombs. Instead, they could use the cash for more rewarding activities: higher social spending, more capital investment or increased aid to the world's poor. Was this optimism warranted?

That overall defence spending has fallen is uncontested. According to the United Nations' latest World Economic and Social Survey, world military expenditure decreased at an average rate of 7.2% a year between 1988 and 1993. The biggest declines came in former Warsaw Pact countries, where defence spending fell by an average of over 22% a year. In America, it fell by 4.4% a year (though the Republican Congress is planning to stem this decline). The cuts are not as steep as some had hoped; but the share of GDP devoted to military spending has fallen everywhere (see chart).

Assessing the economic impact is harder. One crude notion is to calculate what countries would have spent on defence without the cuts. A previous UN report in 1994 suggested that had governments maintained their defence budgets in real terms from 1988 to 1994, global defence spending would have been \$933 billion higher than it was. That suggests a peace dividend of almost \$1 trillion. But such a calculation is flawed: 1987 was a year of high defence spending; had another base year been chosen, the dividend would probably be lower. More important, the sums fail to take into account the broader economic impact of reduced defence spending.

As with any big reduction in public spending, defence cuts tend to reduce economic activity in the short term. That may cause unemployment to rise, particularly in regions where defence-related industries are heavily concentrated. Between 1988 and 1992, for instance, the increase in the unemployment rates of the four American states that are most dependent on defence spending—Connecticut, Virginia, Massachusetts and California—was some two-and-a-half times greater than that in the rest of the country. Such regional effects often make defence cuts politically awkward.

In the long run, however, most economists think that lower defence spending should stimulate growth. One reason for this is that cash can be switched from defence to more productive areas such as education. A second is that smaller military budgets should lead to lower overall government spending, and hence lower borrowing, than would otherwise have been the case. As a result, interest rates should be lower, stimulating private investment. Some economists also argue that lower defence spending will result in fewer distortions in an economy. They point in particular to anti-competitive mechanisms that often feature in military contracts or the trade preferences given to military imports.

But big defence budgets can also have positive side-effects. In countries such as South Korea and Israel, spin-offs from military research and development have helped to foster expertise in civilian high-technology industries. In poor countries with low levels of education and skills, military training might be a good way to improve the educational standard of the workforce. During the cold war some poor countries also relied on the rival superpowers not just for military assistance, but also for other aid. If their erstwhile benefactors cut this aid along with military support, it might leave them with fewer resources overall.

Until recently, there has been little conclusive evidence about the long-run economic impact of lower defence spending. This is partly due to the difficulty of getting