

was the cue to the President that the Congress will not act to stop the operation when under pressure to support the troops. Of course, common sense will tell us that the best way to support our troops is to bring them home as quickly as possible. This idea, that support for the troops once they are engaged means we must continue the operation no matter how ill-advised and perpetuate a conflict that makes no sense, but that is what President Clinton is depending on.

Last week the whole operation in Bosnia changed. The arrest and killing of war criminals by occupation forces coming from thousands of miles away is a most serious escalation of the Bosnia conflict. For outside forces to pronounce judgment on the guilt or innocence of warring factions in a small region of the world is a guarantee that the conflict will escalate. I think those pursuing this policy know this. Prosecuting war criminals is so fraught with danger it seems the need to escalate surpassed all reason.

Yet immediately after the NATO operation, supported by the United States, that resulted in the death of a Serb leader, Clinton strongly suggested that the troops may well not be able to leave in June of 1998 as promised. They were first supposed to leave in December of 1996, and now 18 months after their arrival, the departure date is indefinite, and we in the Congress tragically continue to fund the operation.

This illegal and dangerous military operation will not go unnoticed and will embolden the Serbs and further stir the hatred of the region. Is this policy based on stupidity or is there a sinister motive behind what our world leaders do?

Must we have perpetual war to keep the military appropriations flowing? Does our military work hand in glove in securing new markets? It is not a hidden fact that our own CIA follows our international corporate interests around the globe engaging in corporate espionage and installing dictators when they serve these special interests.

Why would an Air Force plane, with a dozen leading industrialists, be flying into a war-torn region like Bosnia, along with the Secretary of Commerce? I doubt they were on a humanitarian mission to feed the poor and house the homeless.

The lobbyists who pushed the hardest to send troops to Bosnia came from corporations who are now reaping great profits from construction work in Bosnia. It may be the calculation is for a slight escalation of the conflict—that inevitably will accompany any attempt to try war criminals—and no one plans for another great war breaking out in this region.

What might be planned is just enough conflict to keep the appropriations coming. But the possibility of miscalculation is very real. The history of this region should surely warn us of the dangers that lurk around the corner.

We, in the Congress, have a great responsibility in reversing this policy. We must once again assume this responsibility in formulating foreign policy and not acquiesce to the Presi-

dent's pressure to perpetuate a serious misdirected policy of foreign meddling 4,000 miles away from home. We must not fall for the old line that we cannot leave, because to do so, we would not be patriotically "supporting our troops." That is blatant nonsense.

We have already invested \$7.7 billion in this ill-advised military adventure. That money should have either remained in the pockets of working Americans or spent here in the United States.

The New York Times has praised this recent action by Clinton and the NATO forces and has called for more of the same. The New York Times and the Washington Post also support the notion that our troops will have to stay in this region for a lot longer than the middle of next year.

The military industrial complex and its powerful political supporters continue to be well represented in the media and in Washington. Unfortunately, the idea that America is responsible to police the world and provide the funding and the backup military power to impose "peace" in all the disturbed regions of the world remains a policy endorsed by leaders in both parties.

The sooner this policy is challenged and changed, the better off we will be. Our budget will not permit it; it threatens our national security, and worst of all, it threatens our personal liberties.

#### RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN RUSSIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997 the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAPPAS] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, less than 2 weeks ago our Nation celebrated its Independence Day, a day in which all Americans celebrate the many freedoms that were fought to achieve. Several hundred years ago, a group of colonists chose to come across the Atlantic Ocean to settle in and explore a new continent. For many, a prime motivation was to flee from restrictions on their ability to express themselves religiously.

One of the freedoms that we as Americans are so fortunate to have is the ability to associate, organize, express and freely believe in the religion that we so choose.

In Russia, several provisions of a piece of legislation threaten the liberties of its citizens by restricting their freedom to express themselves religiously. It is the most extreme attack on the civil rights of the Russian people since the collapse of the Soviet Union. This new law would terminate and restrict the normal legal status of all religious organizations except those that were registered under the former Soviet Government. This action would result in thousands of churches and schools being forced to end their services, including many American and foreign organizations that have gone to Russia to provide humanitarian and medical assistance to those in need. Even those informal groups that meet

in someone's home could be under state control.

After making such tremendous progress in establishing a democratic system of government over the past few years, this action by the Russian Duma, or parliament, would clearly be a step backward for the Government of Russia.

The people of Russia have suffered and worked hard to achieve a system of government that would eventually give them the fruits of a truly free nation. While our Nation has no official religion and does not give preference to any religion, we recognize the important role that religious organizations have in the lives of our citizens. We can only hope and pray that the leaders of Russia will recognize the same.

This legislation is now sitting on President Boris Yeltsin's desk. I urge President Yeltsin and the leaders of the Russian Government to have the courage to stand up and protect the basic civil rights of Russia's people to express themselves freely and to worship as they so choose.

#### JUVENILE CRIME CONTROL ACT OF 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address what I am seeing as an increasing number of ads and op-ed pieces that mischaracterize H.R. 3, the juvenile crime bill, which passed this body back in May and which is being deliberated in one version or another in the other body right now.

A number of op-eds have said lately things that just are not so. One of the myths is that H.R. 3 mandates that children as young as 13 must be prosecuted as adults and requires States to do the same. That is absolutely false. The juvenile crime bill, H.R. 3, that we passed includes a modest expansion of Federal law which already provides for discretionary prosecution of 13-year-olds. H.R. 3 does not require States to do the same.

Discretionary authority for Federal prosecution of 13-year-old juvenile offenders as adults for the most serious of crimes is nothing new. It became law in the 1994 crime bill through an amendment offered by Senator CAROL MOSELEY-BRAUN of Illinois, a Democrat. Moreover, H.R. 3 does not require States to have this same standard. H.R. 3 provides incentive grants to States to provide prosecutors the option of prosecuting as adults those juveniles who are 15 and older and who have committed murder, rape, or assault with a firearm.

Most States already provide for this option. We wanted to make certain, if they were going to get Federal moneys to improve their juvenile justice systems, that all States did this, and it

would not make sense for States to not prosecute murderers and rapists who are 15-, 16-, and 17-year-olds, especially if they are repeat violent offenders, as adults, because if they do not prosecute them as adults and they did it as juveniles, they will be back on the streets when they do reach the age of adulthood.

The second myth that we are hearing a lot about is that H.R. 3 allows youths as young as 13 to be confined in adult jails and prisons. This also is absolutely false. Nothing in H.R. 3 authorizes or even encourages housing of juveniles with adults. In fact, H.R. 3 prohibits such housing in the Federal system and does nothing to change current laws and regulations affecting State housing policies.

Current Federal law explicitly prohibits housing juveniles with adults in the Federal juvenile justice system. The standard has long been codified in Federal law. It is unchanged by H.R. 3. It is one that prohibits any regular contact between juveniles and adult criminals during any stage of the justice process, pretrial, presentencing, or postsentencing.

So the myth that is out there is that somehow those of us who support H.R. 3 are not concerned with prevention. Well, that is not the purpose of the juvenile crime bill that came forward this time, prevention, but we are concerned with it. Trying to stop and interdict the young person before they get involved with a juvenile offense, misdemeanor or otherwise is very important. There are \$4 billion of Federal at-risk grant programs already available out there and existing, and we are going to be reauthorizing one of them here very shortly dealing with OJJDP, which is the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Mr. Speaker, 4 billion dollars' worth of prevention programs, 131 of those programs in 16 different agencies.

But what H.R. 3 is all about is an effort to try to fix the broken juvenile justice system of this Nation. Some critics are saying this is a State responsibility and the Federal Government does not have any business there. And that I would suggest is not the right way to look at this. Yes, juvenile justice types of programs are in the States, not the Federal system, but the system is broken and there is a Federal responsibility to deal with it.

Today, if a young person comes in contact with the law by having vandalized a home or a store or by spray-painting graffiti on a warehouse, well, the chances are the police will not even take that young person to a juvenile court. And when they do see a juvenile judge, it is often 10 or 12 appearances before they receive any kind of punishment at all. That is not a working juvenile justice system.

Is it any wonder that when a juvenile, having experienced that and some day does pick up a gun in a situation where he might use it, that he thinks about pulling that trigger, believing

there are no consequences? There have to be consequences in the juvenile justice system of this Nation. We need more probation officers, more juvenile judges and more juvenile detention facilities so we can treat juveniles the proper way, and to put consequences into the juvenile justice system again so that there is punishment from the very first juvenile delinquent act.

It is a very important part of what we passed here on the floor with H.R. 3, because it is a requirement in order to get the \$500 million a year authorized by that bill to improve the juvenile justice systems of the States that the State demonstrate to the Justice Department of the United States that they will have in place, and do have in place, a system to sanction the very first juvenile misdemeanor crime of every juvenile who commits one, and graduated, increasing sanctions for every one thereafter.

It is also important, and we have in place as part of this incentive grant program, that records be kept of those who commit felony crimes for the second offense.

H.R. 3 is a good bill. It is a juvenile crime bill. Prevention is also important. The myths about this bill are wrong, and we are proud we passed it. We look forward to seeing the bill from the other body so we can get one to the President shortly.

#### MEDICARE AND THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997 the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, let me take my colleagues back to 1995. Congressional colleagues passed and sent to the President a balanced budget plan that slowed Medicare spending in order to perpetuate and preserve the program. Of course, it being before an election year, the President promptly vetoed the bill, citing, quote, "excessive cuts in Medicare," unquote, as the primary reason for his veto.

Amazingly, the President and his Democrat friends went even further. They based their entire campaign for the Presidency in 1996 and for Congress on the Medicare cuts, the so-called Medicare campaign.

Of course, most Americans knew that the Democrats' fear tactics were baseless, that there were no cuts in Medicare spending. In fact, the budget we passed 2 years ago contained \$1.252 trillion in spending on Medicare for the next 5 years, an increase in funding that more than exceeded twice the rate of inflation.

I call the attention of my colleagues to the first chart on my left. In 1996, the President said, "you remember that budget I vetoed last year because it had excessive cuts in Medicare?" Well, 8 months later the President changed his tune on Medicare, but of

course that is not surprising; the election was over.

In 1997, the President said, "America needs a balanced budget that is in balance with our values, that protects Medicare. That is exactly what this budget does. It keeps our fundamental commitment to our parents, preserving and protecting Medicare."

My colleagues, we may be having a heat wave here in Washington, but it just cannot compare with the President's hot air. Look at this second chart. Under our 1995 budget plan, the one of course that was vetoed by President Clinton because it claimed it had excessive Medicare cuts, total spending on Medicare would have exceeded \$1.25 trillion from 1998 to the year 2002. The balanced budget agreement reached this year between the President and Congress has total Medicare spending of less than \$1.25 trillion over those same years.

The 1995 budget plan, the one which proposes excessive cuts in Medicare, had more funding than the current budget plan. In 1996, \$1.25 trillion in Medicare spending was labeled as having excessive cuts. This year, less than \$1.25 trillion in Medicare spending, is used to preserve and protect this program. As the chart shows, the 1995 budget plan would have provided \$4 billion more in Medicare spending than the current budget. Let me repeat, we spent more on Medicare in the 1995 plan than this 1997 plan endorsed by the President.

I am glad that the President has joined us in an effort to save Medicare, but I hope that he also realizes that Medicare is just too important a program for political theater. If he and his supporters had put politics aside, had rejected petty demagoguery and had rolled up their sleeves to work with us in saving Medicare, he could have put the program in place back then on the path to financial security 2 years ago.

My colleagues, there is no room for partisan games when the health of 30 million Americans is at stake. I am proud of our efforts to protect, preserve, and strengthen Medicare in 1995. It is sad, unfortunately, that others jeopardize the future of Medicare to score political points. We owe it to our 30 million fellow citizens to work together to ensure the solvency of the Medicare Program. Let us put our duty ahead of politics and build a brighter future for all Americans.

#### STOP TAX HIKES ON GRADUATE STUDENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCGOVERN] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, a terrible miscarriage of justice is taking place in the House Republican tax bill, an attack on graduate university students across this country. At a time