

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 Kinser 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 Kinser 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. Kinser 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 Kinser 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. Kinser 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