

GUAM'S ROLE IN OPERATIONS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Guam [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday on Guam, the first of some 2,500 Kurdish refugees arrived as part of Operation Pacific Haven. The movement of these Kurdish refugees who have been associated with United States Government activities is timely and necessary and makes good on an implicit American commitment to their safety.

As was the case 2 weeks ago with the B-52 strikes on Iraq, the role of Guam in the events unfolding in the Middle East is of enormous importance and consequence to our country's actions. Although any map will clearly show that the utilization of Guam might not make geographic sense for Operation Pacific Haven, any understanding of today's world shows that Guam is one of the few reliable places which this country can use in a moment's notice. Without Guam, a reliable United States base, American military flexibility is reduced. For the military planners managing the Mideast crisis, Guam is between Iraq and a hard place.

Given the cumbersome need for fly-over rights as well as the need to seek prior approval of allies, our Nation's mobility and capacity for independent action must increasingly rely on mobile forces, friendly faces, and dependable bases. Guam fits this bill and is proud to play a key role in both the strikes against Iraq and the on-going humanitarian mission for providing safe haven in the Pacific for the Kurdish refugees.

I am grateful for the advance notice and consultation which the White House gave to my office for the latest operation and I hope this level of consultation will continue for any future and sudden change in military activity on Guam. I also urge the Department of Defense to take all necessary steps to ensure the safety of the refugees as well as the community of Guam during the time that it takes to process the refugees for resettlement in the continental United States.

But Mr. Speaker, while Guam remains a cornerstone of America's strategic reach in the world, we on Guam are at times concerned that we are ignored in calmer times, at those times when we craft policy for the territories and for Guam specifically.

Guam has had a long relationship with the United States military—in fact, Guam's relationship with the United States in issues of land, immigration, political status change is always evaluated with an eye to the consequences for America's power projection and strategic reach.

We are proud to play a part in the security of the world, but we should be rewarded for our role rather than penalized or ignored. Guam should be

given additional consideration rather than less consideration and Guam should be treated according to its contribution rather than utilized on the basis of its value.

Mr. Speaker, we have some legislation on the return of land to the Government of Guam once the military no longer needs it and declares it excess. The lands in question have been identified as potentially releasable. The lands in question were condemned by military officials and adjudicated in military courts on Guam in the period from 1945 to 1949, before civil government was re-established.

The legislation which we seek simply puts Guam at the head of the line over other Federal agencies when the Department of Defense decides that they no longer need the land. We are not asking the DOD to release land they need to conduct these operations; we are asking them to release land which their own planners have indicated they no longer need. We are not asking to go beyond Federal laws in how the land is to be handled; we are only asking that given Guam's unique history and given Guam's unique contribution, that Guam be placed at the head of the line for releasable property.

This is a good deal for Guam, but it is more than that. It is a fair deal for all concerned. I urge the members of this institution to support this legislation and I hope that the administration will now support this legislation.

DRUG ABUSE AND MISUSE UNDER THE CLINTON ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor again today, I was here last week, I was here last year, I was here every year since I was elected in 1992, to talk about the problem of drug abuse and drug misuse in our country.

I am here, sadly, 3½ years later again talking about what has taken place with this administration. We see across our great land and in my district the results of what has taken place. Mr. Speaker, let me recap what has taken place with this administration on the question of drug use and drug abuse.

First, this President came in, and what did he do? He cut. He gutted, in fact, the White House drug czar's office from 140 to just a handful of people.

The next thing he did, he employed as the chief health officer of our Nation Joycelyn Elders. Joycelyn Elders began the campaign of just say maybe, kids. Just try it, kids. Maybe we should legalize it, kids. Sending out that message, there was such an uproar that she finally was dismissed.

Then the President took the step of dismantling the drug interdiction program. He dismantled it piece by piece, stopping drugs at their source. We know that cocaine, 100 percent of it is

grown in Bolivia, Peru, and Colombia. We know its transit points, and we can stop it inexpensively at its source. Yet, he dismantled, he gutted this program.

Then finally the ultimate insult to the American people and to the Congress and to the high office of the Presidency, the White House, which is supposed to set the standard for Americans, to set the highest level of performance of acceptability in our society and our Government. What did they do? Things got so bad in the folks that they were employing, and I sat on the committee that heard this testimony and was appalled. The Secret Service was so alarmed that folks were being hired with recent and past drug use histories, and we are not talking about marijuana here folks, we are talking about hallucinogenic drugs. We are talking about crack, about cocaine. We are talking about hard drugs being acceptable, used in the past, recent past in some cases for employment in the White House.

Mr. Speaker, this is not acceptable. And this is what has been done by this administration, what has been done by this President, and this is the result. This is the result in my community. Look at this headline: Long Out of Sight, Heroin Is Back Killing Teens. In the past year central Florida has had more teenage heroin deaths than all the rest of the State.

It is epidemic among our children. This is the result. Look at this: With Reagan and Bush, drug use and abuse went down in this country among our teenagers. And in 1992 it starts to shoot off the charts. Look at how it has affected our children with heroin, with crack, with marijuana, with hallucinogenic drugs. It is epidemic.

We now have 1.6 million Americans in our prisons across this country, and 70 percent of the people that are in our prisons are there because of drug use and abuse. So we have set a bad example from this White House and this administration, and we can see the bad results here, crime and death.

□ 1245

The wrong Americans, too, are behind bars. Our elderly and senior citizens across this Nation are afraid to go out at night because of the crime that this has created. And we know, again, that nearly 70 percent of those incarcerated and convicted of crime are drug-related incidents.

But there is hope. This Congress, under the leadership of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Chairman CLINGER, under the leadership of the gentleman from New Hampshire, Chairman ZELIFF, we are restoring the funds for the drug czar's office and the positions that were cut by this administration. We are bringing back together interdiction. We are going to use the military. We are going to use the coast guard. We are going to stop drugs at their source.

Mr. Speaker, we are not going to just spend all the money on treatment.

Spending all the money on treatment like Clinton wants us to do is, in fact, like treating only the wounded in a battle. We have to fight this with education, interdiction, enforcement, and treatment; all four. The leadership must start in this Congress, and it must start at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue or we will see these results continue.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is not acceptable. It is not acceptable in my community. I ask for assistance to help us make a positive change.

DOLE TAX BREAKS FOR THE RICH NOT FULLY EXPLAINED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANCOCK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, former Senator Bob Dole has unveiled his new economic plan to the American people. He has outlined a \$550 billion tax break, mostly for the wealthy, but he had not told us how he is going to pay for that \$550 billion tax break.

One of Bob Dole's advisers said, "He has no plans to describe specifically what Federal programs he will cut until after the election."

Former Senator Dole, Citizen Dole, is going around the country speaking to organizations promising each of them: I will not cut your programs. In fact, maybe I will increase your programs, one group after another.

Yesterday, talking to some people about crime, he said: You want more prisons? I will double the amount of appropriations for Federal prisons.

So at the same time Senator Dole has said he will increase military spending to the tune of perhaps \$30 or \$40 or \$50 billion a year over the next 5 years, he wants to build star wars. He wants to give this major tax break, increase military spending, increase money for prisons, increase this, increase that, but he will not tell us how he is going to pay for these hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars in tax breaks that he says he will give the American people.

I think it is important then, Mr. Speaker, to look at where in fact this money will come from. I think we only have to turn the calendar back about 1 year to figure out where Senator Dole will get the \$550 billion to pay for the tax break, some couple hundred billion over 4 or 5 years, to pay for military spending increases; the tens of billions to pay for more prison construction; the other billions of dollars that Senator Dole has promised.

Mr. Speaker, I think we need to look back 1 year, turn the calendar back 1 year to figure out how he is going to pay for it. All of us remember about 14 months ago Speaker GINGRICH unveiled the Republican plan to give a \$200-and-some billion tax break mostly for the rich, and to pay for it with \$270 billion

in Medicare cuts, a tax break mostly for the rich paid for by \$270 billion in Medicare cuts.

At the same time in this legislation were major cuts in student loans for middle-class families, major cuts for environmental protection, to pay for inspectors, to pay for enforcement, to pay for environmental cleanup. All of that was in order to pay for the tax break to go mostly to the wealthiest Americans.

Mr. Speaker, it got so bad, as we recall, several months ago that Speaker GINGRICH and Senator Dole shut the Government down because President Clinton vetoed their tax break, mostly for the wealthy paid for with Medicare cuts. President Clinton said: I will not give that kind of a tax break mostly to the rich. I will not give the rich a tax break paid by Medicaid and Medicare and student loan cuts and cuts in environmental protection. It simply did not make sense.

Mr. Speaker, the President was right. Those of us who stuck by the President on this side of the aisle were right, and clearly that is what the American people reiterated over and over and over again. We do not give tax breaks for the rich and cut Medicare and cut Medicaid and cut student loans and cut environmental protection to pay for them.

The same folks who brought us the Government shutdown, the same folks who tried last year for a major cut in Medicare are back this year. Last year the tax break was about \$250 billion for the wealthy. This year the Dole tax cut is twice that, and he is not telling us how he is going to pay for it. So it is clear the way that Senator Dole is going to pay for this major tax break is to go right at the heart of Medicare and right at the heart of Medicaid and right at the heart of student loans and also right at the heart of environmental protection. That is clearly not what the American people want.

Mr. Speaker, the American people last fall, early this winter, blamed Speaker GINGRICH and Senator Dole for the Government shutdown because they did not want to see these major cuts in Medicaid and Medicare and student loans and the environment. Here we go again. Senator Dole wants to give tax breaks of twice that size, but Senator Dole has learned something from his mistake because this year in this campaign, at least before the election, he will not tell us that that in fact is what is going to happen; that it is going to be cuts in Medicare, cuts in Medicaid, cuts in student loans, and cuts in environmental protection.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we understand Senator Dole's and Speaker GINGRICH's attitude toward the Government program that has probably been the best program Government has ever put together, and that has been the Medicare Program. Thirty years ago in 1965, when Lyndon Johnson signed Medicare, only 46 percent of America's elderly had health care insurance; only

46 percent 30 years ago. Today, 99 percent of America's elderly have health care insurance.

Mr. Speaker, Medicare has worked, but we would not know it from listening to Speaker GINGRICH and Senator Dole. Senator Dole and Mr. GINGRICH have made it clear that they oppose these programs. They want to give tax breaks for the wealthy and pay for it with Medicare cuts.

AGAIN, CLINTON IS PROPOSING SOCIALIZED HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, those who ignore history are doomed to repeat it, so goes the saying, a careful reminder to all of us that history teaches us valuable lessons and that, if we learn from the past, we can avoid repeating the mistakes in the future.

Yet despite this very warning, President Clinton and congressional Democrats are plotting a course plagued by controversy and opposition.

The past few weeks have been strikingly reminiscent of President Clinton's first try at a nationalized Government-run health care system. The newspaper headlines of late are uncomfortably familiar. In fact, it is *deja vu* all over again. Recently in Florida, my home State, President Clinton announced the formation of a comprehensive commission charged with reviewing the health care system and making recommendations on how to improve the quality of care provided to patients and how to put in place more consumer protections. Does that sound familiar?

Then he endorsed the notion of mandating what types of benefits health plans should provide and cover. Perhaps that sounds familiar.

He then endorsed the notion that the Federal Government should get in the middle of the contract negotiations between private health care plans and private physicians. Of course that sounds familiar.

The President is clearly headed down a road we have all traveled together before. Under the guise of consumer protection, he is very boldly unveiling the many pieces of his plan that was very familiar and soundly rejected by Congress and the American people only 2 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, we remember President Clinton's Health Security Act. This was an aggressive plan developed by him behind closed doors by his experts. His experts, of course, knew what was best for the American people.

We remember after months of secret discussion the experts had developed the ultimate answer to the rising health care costs. And of course, we remember, despite polls indicating that what the American people wanted most from health care reform was portability of coverage and protection for