

1995-96 by 31 percent. There is a strong return on the investment. European industry expects to post sales of up to \$12 billion from commercial launches of Ariane rockets by the end of the decade.

Although the United States remains a strong competitor with active spaceports and a healthy booster and satellite market, we have not charted a course to regain a leading role in what has become a very large market. Moreover, this very large market promises to be an even larger international enterprise in the 21st century.

We have to take a step out of the box and employ a new approach with regard to commercial space. The first step is educating and making the case that space is more than a NASA, science, or an exploration issue. Space is a vast area of untapped economic potential for local communities, State, and most importantly our Nation.

We are not looking for government to play the leading role, but instead we are looking to the private sector. But if we are to convince the private sector that commercial space is a worthwhile and ultimately profitable undertaking we have to demonstrate Government's commitment to a comprehensive commercial space policy and the development of commercial spaceports.

A spaceport is a transportation center that moves surface infrastructure into space. I believe that we ought to look at spaceports in the same way that we look at airports and treat them just like we would airports. Rather than moving passengers from one place to another, spaceports move commerce from one place to another.

The spaceport philosophy is a commitment to use-friendly environments, integrated launch services, and low-cost access to space. In addition it is important to recognize that facility development is separate from the overall commercial space industry. In the United States, the available parts of the market are launch bases, boosters, and satellites. The missing piece of the puzzle is a facility for the launches and timing is important. It is imperative that spaceport development progress quickly in order to maintain the other elements of the market.

In America today, there are only two existing spaceports, but many more who want to become active spaceports. I would encourage all States who are interested in developing spaceports to get involved. Commercial spaceports means jobs—many jobs. Jobs in building the spaceports; manufacturing rockets and satellites; research, training, and education.

Commercial spaceports produce positive economic return. In California for example, the growth of a spaceport helps in the revitalization of the high-tech industries which have been hurt by defense cuts. This means more high paying jobs, added business for local service providers, new hotels, homes, shopping centers, education centers, and research facilities.

In America we want to do it a little differently than other nations. We want to reach a point where government acts as a facilitator not an obstacle. We want the government to be primarily a customer rather than a provider. We want to give States the flexibility necessary to develop commercial spaceports and attract private industry support. We want to encourage greater private industry support through tax-exempt bond financing. We want spaceport development to progress free of the traditional regulatory barriers imposed by Government.

Mr. Speaker, commercial spaceport development is in the national economic interest. It is an issue of transportation and it should be pursued as part of a national transportation policy. It means jobs, it means economic opportunity, and it requires American leadership.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

A SMALLER, MORE EFFICIENT FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Speaker, for the first time today in 26 years, something very, very unusual has happened. That is, this morning at 1:05 a.m., the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives proposed a balanced budget, a balanced budget, one so that in 7 years our kids and grandkids won't be having more debt to pay off because we were not willing to face the tough task and make the tough choices now to be able to cut things back.

I think this is a grand moment that we are finally addressing this most critical of problems. This year alone the Federal debt is going to \$5 trillion. If we don't balance the budget, going on the current projection path we have, if we don't put our oar into the water to make this happen, it is going to be at \$7 trillion by the year 2002. It is time we do it.

There is only one way we are going to be able to balance the budget. That is, creating a smaller, more focused, more efficient Federal Government, one that was originally intended by the Founding Fathers, one that is not into all functions and tries to do everything for everybody but a limited government, a focused Federal Government, one I think that Thomas Jefferson would be proud of, one that I would hope that Peter Drucker, the management guru, would be proud of for its efficiency, and one most of all that I would hope the American people would be proud of for what it delivers of serv-

ices of what they call on their Government to do.

We have had a Federal Government this past quarter of a century that has grown out of control and everybody has contributed to it, everybody in this country, and in this institution here on both sides of the aisle. It is time to get it back into control. It is time to cut it back. It is time to recreate the limited Government that was always intended by our Founding Fathers.

The Federal Government was not meant to be all things to all people. James Madison wrote early on in the founding of our country this:

"The powers delegated by the proposed Constitution to the Federal Government are few and defined."

We must get the Federal Government back to its core functions of what it was originally intended to be and not flung out here into so many different things but focused, efficient, and smaller so that we can be able to cut back on the spending, so that we can be able to not deliver so much debt to our children, so that we can hold the dream out and push toward even paying off the debt, the nearly \$5 trillion in debt that has been accumulated.

There are a number of proposals that have been put forward. Some of them call for the elimination of whole agencies in the Federal Government, agencies such as the Department of Commerce and Energy, HUD and Education, keeping certain of the core functions that are functions of the Federal Government and should be done by the Federal Government and eliminating other portions, privatizing some functions and sending some functions back to State and local units of government so that at the end of the day we have a smaller, more focused, more efficient Federal Government.

This is an absolute need, if for no other reason than for our children and grandchildren, so that they can have a future, not saddled with this huge debt, not saddled with such an enormous mortgage on America.

HAITI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I rise with great concern over the administration's action in Haiti. On March 31, 1995, President Clinton turned over control of the Multi National Force [MNF] in Haiti, to the United Nations, under the auspice of the U.N. Mission in Haiti [UNMIH]. UNMIH, although still under American command, differs from the previous U.S. operation in two respects. The net effect of these changes is a U.S. commander and U.S. forces under the control of the U.N. Special Representative, Mr. Lakhdar Brahimi and a U.N. mandate for rules of engagement [ROE] which dictate the use of force by U.S. troops.

Mr. Speaker, in his report to the U.N. Security Council on January 17, 1995, Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali stated: "UNMIH will consist of civilian, military and civilian police components under the control of my special representative, Mr. Lakhdar Brahimi." This statement by the Secretary makes it clear he expects that General Kinzer will work under the direction of the United Nations. In his report to Congress on February 1, 1995, President Clinton indirectly acknowledged this by stating "the UNMIH commander will work for the U.N. Special Representative of the Secretary General."

The administration, Mr. Speaker, will respond to my concern by stating that General Kinzer will have operational control of all forces in Haiti. This is a considerable improvement over the situation in Somali, but it is still not good enough. We all remember Somalia, where United States soldiers were shot down and dragged through the streets while under a foreign command, in an event forever etched in American minds.

Mr. Speaker, my concern is best illustrated by the current situation in Bosnia. Lt. Gen. Rupert Smith has the same operational control in Bosnia that Gen. Kinzer has in Haiti. Serbian gunners attacked Butmir last weekend killing 10 and wounding 50. Mr. Speaker this area was well within the exclusion zone. Lt. Gen. Smith requested NATO support enforcing the U.N. resolution protecting Sarajevo by ordering air strikes. With the planes in the air U.N. Special Representative Akashi rejected the request. Mr. Speaker, I ask you how can Lt. Gen. Smith protect his troops and their commitments when his military judgment is overruled by a U.N. representative.

Mr. Speaker, operational control is simply not good enough. We must take additional steps to assure General Kinzer and our troops will not be overruled by the U.N. civilian command when ordering military action.

The second concern I have deals with the revised rules of engagement under UNMIH. The rules of engagement approved by the Security Council are significantly more restrictive than the rules under U.S. command of the Multi National Force. The rules of engagement of UNMIH were mandated by the United Nations; not by the United States. Any changes to the current rules of engagement must go through the Secretary General and the Security Council, not through Gen. Kinzer or any other American. Mr. Speaker, how can the administration assert U.S. command of our forces when policy is evolving not out of the Pentagon, but the United Nations.

The record of U.N. "peacekeeping operations", Mr. Speaker is poor at best. The situation in Bosnia illustrates multiple scenarios were operational control was called into question by the U.N. Special Representative. Moreover, we should never be forced to accept

U.N. mandates for rules of engagement that place unreasonable restrictions on our forces. This is not what the House intended under the National Security Revitalization Act. We must take action to restore the integrity and safety of our forces. We must work quickly to protect our forces from the action taken by the administration, before we are forced to accept another tragedy at the hands of the United Nations.

□ 2045

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WELLER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIPINSKI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. LIPINSKI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

SAVING MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to give a brief review of how this Congress is fighting for our senior citizens across the country. First, we rolled back the Social Security tax increase of 1993. Second, we have raised the income eligibility level above \$11,200 for those under 70. Over the next 5 years, Mr. Speaker, seniors will be able to earn income up to \$30,000 without ever having a deduction from their Social Security. Third, Social Security is off the table, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to this budget. And fourth, now House Republicans are determined to save Medicare by using new approaches, new managements, and new technologies to improve it, preserve it, protect it, and eliminate the fraud and abuse.

The Clinton Administration's Trustees Report on Medicare warns that the Medicare trust fund starts to go broke in 1996 and could be bankrupt by 2002. The current Government-controlled Health Care Finance Administration system has much waste and fraud. The General Accounting Office estimates \$44 billion a year in Medicare and Medicaid fraud.

Our legislation will obviously make sure that these changes are made so that a strong Medicare system is what we have restored.

We also want to give senior citizens an incentive to fight waste and fraud by paying them 25 percent of any waste or fraud that they find on their bills. We want to strengthen and empower our senior citizens.

Republicans will also increase Medicare spending from \$4,700 per retiree today to \$6,300 per retiree in 2002. That is a 34-percent increase in Medicare spending per retiree. There is absolutely no cut in Medicare spending.

We will preserve the current Medicare system for seniors who want it, but no one will of course be forced into

a system they do not want. We will create a series of new choices so senior citizens can control their own future, Mr. Speaker. Any good ideas citizens have would be appreciated by their Representative on Commerce and Ways and Means Committees as they develop a new and improved Medicare system.

As for me, Mr. Speaker, I will be heading a Medicare preservation task force for the purpose of preserving, improving, and protecting our Medicare system for our seniors.

Together we can create a Medicare system that offers the best care at the lowest cost with the senior citizens having the greatest control over their own health care. We will improve Medicare so it can be protected and saved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. CLAYTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BECERRA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

BUDGET RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, we have heard comments today about the action of the House Budget Committee early this morning in enacting a budget resolution which basically sets the spending goals for Congress for the next year. But before I address that, I would like to remind those who are listening that just a few weeks ago on the floor of this House of Representatives, as part of the so-called Republican Contract With America, the Republicans by and large with a few Democratic votes enacted a tax cut, yes, a tax cut during a period of high Federal deficits.

Many people, including a number of Republicans, questioned the wisdom of cutting taxes when in fact we are in the red. But the Republicans were determined to do it and went ahead with their plan. Their plan, unfortunately, did not cut taxes primarily for middle-income and working families. No; primarily the tax breaks went to wealthy corporations and wealthy individuals. In fact, for 1.71 million Americans the Republican plan will result in a \$20,000 tax break.

Now you cannot give away those Federal taxes without it costing you something, and in fact over the next 7 years that Republican tax break is going to