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.