

to send it to Washington to support education programs reflective only of the values and priorities of Congress and the Federal bureaucracy, not the parents.

The \$3,000 tax credit will make a better education affordable for millions of parents. Mr. Speaker, many parents who would choose to send their children to private, religious, or parochial schools are unable to afford the tuition, in large part because of the enormous tax burden imposed on the American family by Washington.

The Family Education Freedom Act also benefits parents who choose to send their children to public schools. Although public schools are traditionally financed through local taxes, increasingly, parents who wish their children to receive a quality education may wish to use their credit to improve their schools by helping financing the purchase of educational tools such as computers or extracurricular activities such as music programs. Parents of public school students may also wish to use the credit to pay for special services for their children.

Greater parental support and involvement is surely a better way to improve public schools than funneling more Federal tax dollars, followed by greater Federal control, into the public schools. Furthermore, a greater reliance on parental expenditures rather than Government tax dollars will help make the public schools into true community schools that reflect the wishes of parents and the interests of the students.

The Family Education Freedom Act will also aide those parents who choose to educate their children at home. Home schooling has become an increasingly popular, and successful method, of educating children. According to recent studies, home schooled children outperform their public school peers by 30 to 37 percentile points across all subjects on nationally normed, standardized achievement exams. Home schooling parents spend thousands of dollars annually, in addition to the wages foregone by the spouse who foregoes outside employment, in order to educate their children in the loving environment of the home.

Ultimately, Mr. Speaker, this bill is about freedom. Parental control of child rearing, especially education, is one of the bulwarks of liberty. No nation can remain free when the State has greater influence over the knowledge and values transmitted to children than the family.

By moving to restore the primacy of parents to education, the Family Education Freedom Act will not only improve America's education, it will restore a parent's right to choose how best to educate one's own child, a fundamental freedom that has been eroded by the increase in Federal education expenditures and the corresponding decrease in the ability of parents to provide for their children's education out of their own pockets. I call on all my colleagues to join me in allowing parents to devote more of their resources to their children's education and less to feed the wasteful Washington bureaucracy by supporting the Family Education Freedom Act.

THE IMPORTANCE OF OUR BILATERAL RELATIONSHIP WITH THE REPUBLIC OF THE MARSHALL ISLANDS: A 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing House Concurrent Resolution , a resolution that reconfirms the importance of our bilateral relationship with the Republic of the Marshall Islands.

April 2, 1997 was the 50th anniversary of a special political relationship and strategic partnership between the United States and the people of the Marshall Islands. On that date in 1947, the Security Council of the United Nations approved the Trusteeship Agreement for the Former Japanese Mandated Islands.

This agreement was negotiated by the Truman administration and gave the United States strategic control of a vast area of the Pacific formerly held by Japan as a League of Nations Mandate. What became known under U.S. law as the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands [TTPI] was the only U.N. trusteeship out of eleven created after WWII classified by the Security Council as "strategic."

Recognition of the strategic nature of the U.S. administration of the TTPI was appropriate in light of the fact that in 1946, while the islands were still under military occupation following the end of hostilities that ended Japanese rule, the U.S. already had commenced its vital nuclear weapons testing program at Bikini in the Marshall Islands.

In 1946 President Truman had sent a young Congressman from Montana on an inspection trip to the region. Mike Mansfield came back and argued eloquently on the floor of the House that the Congress should approve the trusteeship agreement with the United Nations because the U.S. national interest would be served by strategic control of the islands. He was right.

The 2,000 Marshall Islands became the focal point of the U.S. strategic program. In addition to the nuclear testing program at Bikini and Enewetak from 1946 to 1958 the United States has maintained one of its most vital military installations anywhere on earth in the Marshall Islands throughout the second half of this century; the Mid-Pacific Missile Testing Range at Kwajalein Atoll.

Thus, while the U.S. also has maintained relations with the other island groups in the region, the relationship with the Marshall Islands has been a special strategic partnership. This was recognized in the bilateral agreements between the U.S. and the Marshall Islands which were concluded at the time the U.N. trusteeship was terminated based on entry into force of the Compact of Free Association.

For example, the separate bilateral agreements with the Republic of the Marshall Islands included not only the military base rights at Kwajalein, but the agreement establishing the framework within which the U.S. would continue after termination of the trusteeship to address the effects of the nuclear testing program on the people of the Marshall Islands and their homelands. For these island peoples, the nuclear testing program is a legacy that looms as large in their lives as WWII does in the American experience.

In other words, it is a legacy of fortitude in the face of a threat to survival itself. The U.S. nuclear testing program in the cold war era, far more than the fact that major battles of WWII itself had taken place in the Marshalls, was the defining experience of the Marshallese people in this century.

Obviously, there have been legal claims and controversies arising from the intrusion of the nuclear age into the world of the islanders. But this resolution recognizes that out of the adversity there was also forged an alliance that has been sustained throughout the years. The Marshallese people had the wisdom to recognize that the United States was playing a vital role in the maintenance of international peace and security, and although they demanded justice and the redress of injuries as all people have the right to do, the Marshallese people and their leaders never turned their back on the U.S. when we needed them as a strategic partner.

During the twilight years of the cold war the Marshall Islands stood by the United States even though they had far more reasons—they had wanted them—to move out of alignment with this nation than many of those governments which did just that. The Marshalls, however, never viewed the close political and strategic partnership with the U.S. as an unmanageable constraint on their cultural and political identity as a nation.

Thus, the relationship between the Republic of the Marshall Islands and the United States represents not only a successful strategic partnership, but a successful process of decolonization consistent with the goals of the U.N. trusteeship system. This is a foreign policy success of which the Congress and the people of the United States should be proud. Understanding and sustaining this success may have significance for the U.S. in its relations with other peoples and nations as well, and this should not be overlooked.

This is a special relationship which we cannot allow to be neglected or unduly diminished as a result of ill-conceived policies which do not take into account the legacy of the past and the prospects for the future. Narrow thinking based on short-term priorities should not control the determination of how this relationship will be managed as the first term of the Compact of Free Association comes to an end. Congress must take responsibility to exercise oversight with respect to the formulation of a long-term policy for our bilateral relationship with the Marshall Islands.

As an ally and strategic partner, the Republic of the Marshall Islands has paid a uniquely high price to define its national interest in a manner that also has been compatible with vital U.S. national interests. That is what an alliance is in its most essential form, and that is what Congress will recognize by adopting this resolution. I urge my colleagues to support House Concurrent Resolution .

REPORT FROM INDIANA—RON CLARK

HON. DAVID M. McINTOSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. McINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to give my Report from Indiana.