

been eligible for millions more in discretionary grants—money for boys and girls clubs, and antigang grants.

Those funds are now in doubt. Mr. Speaker, it is by now well established that it is for more costly to incarcerate an individual than it is to train or educate him. Prisons are warehouses and training grounds for further criminal activity. If we are serious about crime prevention, we should put more police on the streets and provide resources for programs that discourage crime. The Local Law Enforcement Block Grants Act undercuts that effort. This bill should be defeated.

#### HIGHER MINIMUM WAGE EQUALS HIGHER UNEMPLOYMENT

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

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, during President Clinton's State of the Union Address, he purposed an increase in the minimum wage. The administration has asked for an increase of 90 cents over 2 years. This will raise the current wage from \$4.25 an hour to \$5.15 an hour.

The President says that every person should receive a living wage for a good days work. I say three cheers to that, I cannot agree more with the President.

I believe that every American should be paid a fair wage.

However, the President and I disagree on how exactly we get there. President Clinton believes that the Government should mandate a wage.

On the other hand, I believe that the businesses and workers should negotiate their own wages and allow the free market to work.

Mr. Speaker, I think I can explain why the President and his administration have taken this flawed path.

Their heart is in the right place, but they are stuck in the same rut they have been in for years. Jeff Joseph from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce explained it perfectly last week. Let me quote from him, when he talked about why the minimum wage mandate is bad:

Primarily because it's a 60-year-old idea that doesn't fit in the global world we live in today. We shouldn't be talking about minimum wages and minimum skills. We should be figuring out how our workers can have world-class skills so they can earn world-class livings. You know, with the welfare debate that's going on today, people can get in the welfare system and earn about—the equivalent of \$16,000 a year.

So the debate should not be how do we get people from \$8,000 to \$9,000. The issue is how do we get people with the skills so they can go out and get off welfare and go out and earn \$20,000 and \$30,000 a year? "And this 60-year-old idea that says there is an artificial minimum which gets put out there which only ratchets up the rest of the system with inflation and makes our valuable goods and services cost more

in a world marketplace, it becomes a self defeating idea that hurts us economically."

The administration has a superficial and incomplete understanding of the way markets work.

This is not surprising from an administration populated by so many who have never held real private sector jobs, owned a business, or met a payroll.

Last year during the national health care debate, Americans were stunned to hear their President lecture the owner of Godfather's Pizza not to worry about the Clinton health insurance mandate on employers because Godfathers could just increase the price of its pizzas to offset the cost of the mandate.

In other words, in the world of "Clinton-Commerce," mom and pop businesses can make as much money as they need by just raising the prices of their products high enough. Never mind income taxes, never mind unemployment taxes, never mind unfunded mandates; just raise prices.

Obviously the President does not have a firm grasp on the law of supply and demand.

This same lack of understanding is exhibited with regard to Government taxation. In the President's mind, Uncle Sam can raise as much money as it desires just by increasing tax rates high enough.

A perfect example was his enormous retroactive tax increase that hit the Americans taxpayers with 2 years ago. Even with this retroactive tax increase, there is already solid evidence that Uncle Sam will collect less than half of what was expected.

Next year, I am sure, that after everyone has had a chance to fully adjust their behavior, virtually all of the expected revenue increase will evaporate.

Now he wants to apply the same kind of "quack-economics" to the minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker, let me take a few minutes to explain why I believe the free market is a better judge of what a fair wage should be.

During the President's State of the Union address, he said the following: "I believe the weight of the evidence is that a modest increase [in minimum wage] does not cost jobs and may even lure people back into the job market."

Well, he has it half right. If the Government artificially forces wages above the market wage, it will certainly entice more people into the job market. This is called the supply-side effect.

But, what he seems to ignore is the demand-side effect. At these higher wages, who is going to hire all of these new job seekers? In fact, not only will employers have to pay more to hire new workers, they will have to pay their current workers even more if they are making under \$5.15 an hour.

As all serious economists recognize, the net effect of increasing the minimum wage will be to increase the supply of job seekers and decrease the number of job offers. In short, raising the minimum wage will actually kill

jobs and increase the unemployment rate.

Even liberal Democrats quickly learn the true effects of the Federal mandates they impose when they have to meet a payroll. For example, former Democrat Presidential candidate George McGovern learned this lesson first hand when he became an inn-keeper and restaurateur. A few years ago, in a Wall Street Journal, Senator McGovern lamented on how he too had to struggle with regulations, mandates and taxes imposed by the Federal Government on his small business.

Mr. Speaker, compassionate politicians and well-meaning Government programs like the minimum wage cannot repeal the law of supply and demand any more effectively than they can repeal the law of gravity.

In closing, I have here in my hand, more than 20 years of research, more than 100 studies completed by some of the most eminent economist from all over this country, that exhibit the destructive effects of the minimum wage. These studies show that an increase in the minimum wage will kill jobs and destroy opportunities for the same people "compassionate" liberals say they want to help.

Mr. Speaker, later today I will place this list of studies in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so all Americans can see for themselves how a minimum wage increase hurts the very people it is suppose to help.

□ 0950

#### DEBUNKING THE MYTHS: THE 100,000 COPS PROGRAM WORKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, the debate today will be police versus pork and politics versus public safety.

Here is what the President said about the cops program:

I made a commitment, a promise, to put a hundred thousand more police in our streets because there is simply no better crime fighting tool to be found. I intend to keep that promise. Anyone on Capitol Hill who wants to play partisan politics with police officers for America should listen carefully. I will veto any effort to repeal or undermine the hundred thousand police commitment, period.

Mr. Speaker, under the Republican plan there is no guarantee that one police officer will be hired. It is a pork program of the highest order. Here are five myths about the cops program that they are going to try to perpetuate:

Myth No. 1, that the cops program will not put 100,000 new officers on the street. It works. The plan does work. With this week's COPS FAST awards the President has already provided grants to hire almost 17,000 new police officers in just 4 months. He is well on

the way of reaching 100,000 new community police officers, and we cannot retreat from this goal.

Myth No. 2: Crime is only a big city problem, so the cops program only helps big cities. Not the case. Primarily it benefits small towns and rural America. This week's COPS FAST awards went only to towns and communities with populations under 50,000. \$433 million awarded under COPS FAST is going to enable over 6,500 such small jurisdictions to hire over 7,100 new community police officers.

Myth No. 3, the cops program is another bureaucratic Federal program that imposes so many restrictions on cities and towns. It is one of the least bureaucratic programs; one page application, one page and you can proceed to have an application looked at by the Justice Department. The Justice Department announced that the COPS FAST program grants less than 6 weeks after the application deadline.

Myth No. 4: Law enforcement officers oppose the cops program. Here are some quotes. "Not the case." "We strongly support you, Mr. President, in your resolve to fight any diversion of funds earmarked for the hiring of a hundred thousand police officers." Letter from Dewey Stokes, national president, Fraternal Order of Police, to the President.

Here is another quote from the Ohio Sheriff Gene Kelly: "Our President in 1992 said he would not forget the people in small towns and countries throughout America. He has more than kept his promise to us all."

From the chief of police in Maryland, Mary Ann Viverette, from Gaithersburg, MD: "Because of President Clinton's effort we will soon see a hundred thousand new police on the streets without smoke and mirrors. On behalf of my colleagues here and across America, thank you."

Mr. Speaker, let police versus pork make police the winner and politics versus public safety make public safety the winner.

#### H.R. 728 TERMED A "PORK BLOCK GRANT BILL"

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, last year I voted for the Crime Control Act of 1994 which promised Americans who live in fear of crime 100,000 more cops on the beat in community policing.

Already, 17,000 cops have been provided to more than 8,000 large cities and small towns. In my district alone 67 cops will make my constituents safer.

Today we are debating H.R. 728 the pork block grant bill which eliminates the Community Policing Program.

Community policing is not some new untried approach. It has been used in

many places across the country. Putting cops on the street makes people safer.

Community policing puts police on our streets who know the neighborhoods and work with residents to reduce crime. Officers who take the time to build relationships with citizens. Officers who get leads from contacts who see crime committed. Officers who understand the community's crime problems, and know the needs of the neighborhood.

Community policing takes cops out from behind their desks and puts them back on the beat to prevent crime, if possible, and to punish criminals.

Community policing does not simply add more police, it creates community leaders. These officers serve as role models, advisors, and assistants to the citizens they serve.

In my district, the Cleghorn neighborhood in the city of Fitchburg was deteriorating because of increasing crime. A community policing program started 4 years ago in Cleghorn caused a dramatic drop in crime. Here is what happened after 4 years of community policing: 25 percent decrease in assaults; 55 percent decrease in burglary; 55 percent decrease in weapons possession; 23 percent decrease in domestic violence; and 67 percent decrease in disorderly conduct.

The mayor of Fitchburg says there is no substitute for a consistent police presence in a troubled neighborhood. Community policing has helped make that neighborhood safe for families again.

And Fitchburg has received seven added cops under the 1994 Crime Control Act of 1994 to expand the Cleghorn experience to other troubled neighborhoods in that city.

But this pork block grant bill, H.R. 728, means fewer police officers catching criminals, fewer officers patrolling neighborhoods, fewer officers building partnerships based on trust, and fewer people safe in their neighborhoods.

In my district, violence and street crime are not just city problems. Community policing funds cops in small cities and towns.

The "COPS FAST" Program was designed specifically to help rural communities and smaller towns. In many of my communities, just one or two additional officers can make a world of difference.

Communities in my district and throughout the country have made decisions based on the commitment we made last year. We cannot walk away from this commitment. Community policing works. Now is not the time to break the promise we made to our citizens who live in fear.

Mr. Speaker, we, Republicans and Democrats, agreed that we need more cops on the beat to keep people safe. So why does the Republican contract cut funds for new police?

Under this pork block grant, the cops on the beat program would no longer exist. There the block grant does not guarantee a single new police officer

would be added. The block grant would not ensure that the hardest hit communities get help.

The block grant in H.R. 728 permits pork-barrel spending in broad categories without guaranteeing any more police on our streets.

Police will have to compete with street lighting, tree removal, and other pet projects.

H.R. 728 ignores the demonstrated effectiveness of community policing and does nothing to stop crime before it starts.

This bill promises everything to everybody and delivers nothing to nobody. It makes the communities in my district less safe than they were under last year's crime bill.

Wake up, America, the pork block grant in H.R. 728 is a sham.

It is not smart. It is not savings.

I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 728.

#### SPACE SHUTTLE COMPLETES SUCCESSFUL MISSION WITH FIRST WOMAN PILOT

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

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, this past week, parts of our country could gaze proudly upon the stars and see the outlines of space shuttle *Discovery's* historic 37-foot fly-by rendezvous with Russia's MIR space station. This shuttle mission, which was completed on Saturday, was historic not just because it was a dress rehearsal for the shuttle-MIR docking in June but also because it contained a number of firsts.

*Discovery's* mission not only paved the way for the first of seven shuttle flights to dock with MIR, but its crew of six included Air Force Lt. Col. Eileen Collins, the first woman ever assigned to pilot a shuttle, and Dr. Bernard Harris, the first African-American astronaut ever assigned to a spacewalk.

Ever since Sally Ride lifted off and became the first American woman in space, our space shuttles routinely have carried female crew members to perform research, spacewalks, repairs, and other functions. Nineteen other women, before Eileen Collins aboard *Discovery*, had flown on shuttles but none had ever piloted the spacecraft.

To commemorate this historic event, dozens of female pilots converged at Kennedy Space Center to watch Lieutenant Colonel Collins' launch. Inspired by the civilian women Air Force pilots who delivered planes to airfields during World War II, Lieutenant Colonel Collins made a point of inviting them as living examples of how far women and our Nation's aeronautics and space program have come.

To honor the role models who inspired her career, Lieutenant Colonel Collins carried with her a scarf worn by