

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

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.