

Amelia Earhart and insignia wings worn by women pilots in World War II. To honor her efforts, her predecessors, and her colleagues aboard *Discovery*, we will all be carrying with us our country's pride for their job well done.

#### IN SUPPORT OF INCREASING THE MINIMUM WAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. BROWN] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of an increase in the minimum wage—it is long overdue. If we really want to reward hard working families, this is the way to start.

Today, I have the honor of welcoming to Washington, my constituent, Annie Busby, who traveled all the way from Apopka, FL because she believes in raising the minimum wage. She was once a driver for Wells Fargo but lost that job when she was injured. Annie Busby supports three children and has held a number of temporary jobs. Raising the minimum wage will make a difference to Annie and her family.

Rev. Jesse Jackson says most Americans are working hard and working every day, but they are not making enough for that work to support their families.

A 90 cent increase in the minimum wage will help raise the standard of living for a family of four. The extension of earned income tax credit helped lift hundreds of thousands of working families. Yet, by 1996, even the EITC is not enough to lift a family of four above the poverty line if they are making the current minimum wage. A 90-cent minimum wage increase can make a real difference to a struggling family.

More than 70 percent of Americans want to see the minimum wage raised. Let us listen to working America and do the right thing.

#### INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO PREVENT FEMALE GENITAL MUTILATION AND THE DANGERS OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY REVITALIZATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, first of all, today I am going to be introducing legislation with the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] and the gentlewoman from Michigan [Miss COLLINS] on female genital mutilation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to put my statement in the RECORD, and I think it is long overdue that this country prohibits such mutilation in this country, and let me do that at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, today I and Representatives COLLINS of Michigan and MORELLA of Maryland are reintroducing a bill that would make it illegal to mutilate women in the name of tradition.

The practice is called female genital mutilation, a painful ritual that involves cutting off all or part of a female's genitalia. Over 100 million girls and women in the world have undergone some form of FGM, and I have received anecdotal reports that it is happening here.

Our Federal Prohibition of Female Genital Mutilation Act of 1995 would make practitioners of FGM subject to criminal penalties. And it establishes penalties for physicians who discriminate against women who have been subjected to FGM.

It authorizes the Department of Health and Human Services to compile data on females living in this country who have been experienced FGM. HHS also would identify U.S. communities that practice FGM and educate them about its effects on physical and psychological health. Finally, the bill would instruct HHS to develop and disseminate recommendations for the education of students of schools of medicine and osteopathic medicine regarding FGM and its complications.

These provisions would give doctors and social workers the information they need to treat the health needs of women who have undergone FGM and begin education to eradicate it in this country.

FGM is not comparable to male circumcision, unless one considers circumcision amputation. FGM causes serious health problems—bleeding, chronic urinary tract and pelvic infections, build-up of scar tissue, and infertility. Women who have been genitally mutilated suffer severe trauma, painful intercourse, higher risk of AIDS, and childbirth complications.

The practice of FGM stems from an intricate mix of traditional African perceptions of gender roles, sex, health, local customs, superstition, and religion. The net result is total control over a woman's sexuality and reproductive system. While we welcome immigrants from countries that practice FGM, we do not welcome their practice of such mutilation here. FGM has no medical purpose and is contrary to our beliefs about women's equality and place in society.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak about one other thing because of last night. Many people wondered what it was that many of us were talking about when we came to the floor last night about this contract. As my colleagues know, I felt like road kill on this Gingrich revolution that is rolling along, but, when we get to this bill that we will be taking up tomorrow, H.R. 7, I have got some very serious questions about who is this omniscient soul that wrote this part.

What it will do, first of all, is allow political appointees to a commission to oversee the Defense Department. Now that is a very serious thing. When we dealt with this in the National Security Committee, no one knew where this came from, and read yesterday's New York Times. Let me just read for my colleagues that first paragraph. It says:

This week Congress is going to consider legislation that would undermine this and every future President's ability to safeguard America's security and to command our armed forces.

Now that is a heavy sentence. It goes on to say:

The measure is deeply flawed, and it is called the National Security Revitalization Act, but, if adopted, it would do just the opposite and endanger national security.

I ask, "Why?" Do you want political appointees on a commission that runs for nothing making these decisions? I do not think so. I mean most of us do not want a committee running anything. We all know the joke about a camel being a horse designed by a committee. Imagine what kind of defense could be designed by political commissions overseeing the Pentagon.

But this goes on to do other things. It mandates that we move forward with space-based defense. That could cost at least \$40 billion. The question is where do we get it. Do we take it out of readiness? We are moving forward with theater missile defense, and there seems to be no one with the missile capability to shoot this far, so why are we doing that, and why are we doing it in such haste, and why when we decided not to do that in prior times, when there was a cold war, there is now such a rush to do it at this moment?

We are also announcing unilaterally we will not participate in further U.N. peacekeeping operations. Wow, there is something. I ask, "Wouldn't we really rather see what those missions were?" And we furthermore dictate to NATO who must be admitted and how they must be admitted. That is also wrong.

I hope everybody reads the New York Times yesterday and takes this very seriously because this could be very, very damaging to America's future.

#### CLARIFICATION OF H.R. 7

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to go over a couple of items that are in the National Security Revitalization Act. I say to my colleagues, "Before you get concerned about and get whipped up to a level of hysteria about this, let's take a look at some of the things that it does."

First of all, it states that it is our policy to prohibit the deployment of U.S. troops under the command of the United Nations. H.R. 7 would prohibit the placement of U.S. forces under foreign command or control during U.N. peacekeeping operations unless Congress specifically authorizes it or if the President certifies that it is in our U.S. national security interest. It does not prohibit it completely. What it does is it requires that there be congressional intervention with respect to this.

Second of all, it requires truth in U.N. accounting. Under H.R. 7, Mr.

Speaker, the United States is going to get credit for expenses which the military incurs supporting U.N. peacekeeping operations. Right now these costs are being double accounted for by the United Nations so that we are paying more than we ought to be paying.

It also requires that there be a genuine analysis, there be a genuine complete analysis and review of our Armed Forces situation, and not that we are going to rule the Armed Forces by committee, but that we're going to actually do the kind of analysis that President Clinton wanted to have but did not get.

Mr. Speaker, I had to address that because of the gentlewoman from Colorado's distortion of what is going on with this bill.

The other thing that I wanted to point out is that we are going to be dealing with block grants on the floor today in the crime bill, and I wanted to bring to the Speaker's attention the fact that the Washington Post this morning, in a rare moment of clarity, wisdom, and intelligence, has editorialized on the fact that this program ought to be supported, that the 100,000 cops program of the President's was a fraud. They said, quote, almost immediately that program was challenged by law enforcement experts and some local officials. In fact, the law created a 5-year matching program during which the Federal Government's share diminished and disappeared, leaving localities with the full cost of maintaining the new officers, close quote.

□ 1010

I know that absolutely to be a fact, because I, like most Members in this body, were very much aware that they had mayors telling them, and police chiefs telling them, that they would not even apply for cops grants because they simply could not afford to pay for them.

We will be voting on that today. I appreciate the Washington Post's support.

#### SUPPORT THE JACKSON-LEE AMENDMENT TO THE LAW ENFORCEMENT BLOCK GRANTS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, last September the President signed the most comprehensive, toughest, smartest crime bill in the history of this institution. It is a crime bill that put better than \$10 billion to build new prisons and combined community policing, 100,000 new police officers with prevention programs that work. It has bipartisan support at that time, Republicans and Democrats signing on, Members of the other body, prominent Republicans signing on. It was a bipartisan bill.

But, unfortunately for some people in this institution, the President apparently got too much credit for that bill.

So now we have a new bill. This bill has a Republican label on it. It attempts to throw all the money from community policing into block grants and hope that county commissioners and school committee members and hope that city councils and local officials somehow become law enforcement professionals and spend the money the right way.

Even though we have a history from 1968 where 33 percent of that money went to administrative costs, we are going to tinker and change this crime bill to take away the label of a Democratic bill or a President Clinton bill.

Before I got to Congress, I was the first assistant district attorney in Middlesex County. Our office managed 13,000 criminal cases a year. I want to tell my colleagues, fighting crime is serious business. You do not fight crime by taking a political poll. You do not fight crime by listening to a focus group. And you do not fight crime by signing on to a document that is put together by political strategists. It is very serious business.

The 100,000 new police officers on the streets, and the previous speaker talker about local governments having to match the money. Ladies and gentlemen, 95 percent of the crimes in this country are prosecuted and enforced by local government. In spite of any rhetoric or any spin you want to put on it, the Congress does not fight the majority of crimes in this country. Ninety-five percent of them are local district attorneys, local States attorneys offices and local police departments. They have that responsibility.

This bill seeks to take some funds and get them focused on community policing, because, guess what? Community policing works. There have been studies over a period of 6 years, and I know from my own experiences as a former prosecutor, community policing works. Community policing is the most effective cutting edge law enforcement tool that we have. Yet because of politics, partisan politics, it appears we want to tinker with that process.

It is working in my home city of Lowell, MA, where we have seen in 1 year 13 additional community police officers opening up a precinct station in the city which has resulted in reducing crime dramatically, 20 to 40 percent.

Now, the new Republican majority has ignored facts about prevention programs, because they have found political profit in labeling them "pork." Apparently if you have the right sound bite, you can label prevention programs pork and it works politically. And after considering all of the information available, like studies, for example, law enforcement studies, I have a hard time figuring out why the new majority is so insistent on pushing this bill. It is bad for efforts to fight crime, it is a bad bill.

I suspect the Republicans are feeling boxed in by the promises they made in the Contract With America. Their crime bill, like much of the contract's

agenda, was drafted based on polls and focus groups. But, friends, what sounds good during a campaign and what makes sense in fighting crime for America, are two very different things.

I know from experience. Republicans, like Gov. Bill Weld from Massachusetts, a former prosecutor, strongly supported this crime bill. The Republican DA in Suffolk County, Ralph Martin, strongly supports the Democratic crime bill, the Clinton crime bill. And I believe that a majority of Republican Members know it as well.

A major test of the Republican Party's ability to govern will be their willingness to admit that many of their campaign promises are unworkable. And to forge a consensus on what to do about it, judging from their work on crime offer the last couple of days, reality has yet to sink in.

I urge my colleagues to take the data that is available from law enforcement professionals all across the country and not to tinker with this crime bill, to put in the prevention programs that work.

What we face this week is serious business. Let us not tinker with this bill and hope the President is going to veto it. Let us take care of the business right here.

#### CLINTON ADMINISTRATION/MEXICAN PESO CRISIS: THEY SHOULD HAVE KNOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most amazing aspect of the Clinton administration's \$53 billion loan bailout of Mexico—\$20 billion of which comes straight out of the pockets of the U.S. taxpayers—is that it's a bailout that should not have happened.

As the Washington Post recently reported, there were signs as early as February of last year that Mexico's economy was in serious trouble. At that time the International Monetary Fund issued a report stating that Mexico's consumption of foreign goods and services was outpacing the ability of its economy to pay for them. In other words, it was living on borrowed time—and money.

Clinton administration officials expressed no alarm, not even when foreign investors began shifting money to dollar-denominated investments that would make it easier to pull funds out of Mexico. As a former analyst for Mexico's Banca Serfin Banking group said, "That's a clear sign something was wrong \* \* \* if the American Government didn't see that, they're blind."

But that did not stop then-Treasury Secretary Lloyd Bentsen from claiming in mid-February that Mexico "has become an example for all of Latin America." He said this one year ago.