

in a troubled neighborhood. Community policing has helped make that neighborhood safe for families again.

Now, the Republican bill eliminates the community policing program, and that means fewer police officers catching criminals, fewer patrolling the neighborhoods, fewer building partnerships based on trust, and fewer people safe in their neighborhoods. The community policing program we passed last year ensures funding for small cities and towns.

My constituents know that violent crime is not just a city problem, and 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.

In Dalton, a small town in my district, under 10,000 people, the chief of police, Dan Fillio, said that the Cops Fast grant gives him another set of eyes and ears out on the streets.

Community policing works. Now is not the time to break the promise we made to our citizens who live in fear.

Under the Republican bills, small towns in my district will have little chance of getting help.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans and Democrats agrees on one thing during last year's crime bill debate. We need more cops on the beat to help keep people safe. So why does the Republican contract cut funds for new police?

The contract combines the tried and true community policing program with a host of crime prevention programs and replaces it with a block grant, and then cuts the funding besides. Mr. Speaker, the block grant, the Republican block grant, is a shell game. Under the Republican bill, police will have to compete with other community groups, even those involved in street lighting, tree removal, and disaster preparedness.

The Republican bill makes no guarantees that money will go for additional cops.

Will American be safer if dollars are used to hire consultants? Will we be safer if the money is used to buy equipment? Will we be safer if it pays for desks? Well, the answer, obviously, Mr. Speaker, is no. People feel safe when they see a cop in their neighborhoods. We helped put them there last year, and this year the other side is taking them away.

My mayors and police and police chiefs lose in the block grant shell game. All the money for new cops will go to big cities with population numbers and crime statistics the Republican contract requires. This is not smart. This is not savings.

Wake up, America. Do not fall for the shell game.

#### WELFARE REFORM, THE MINIMUM WAGE IN BLOCK GRANTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUNNINGHAM). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode

Island [Mr. REED] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, when we talk about welfare reform, work is and should be the centerpiece. During this welfare reform debate, I have heard many people declare that they find it amazing that so many individuals do not work. What I find equally amazing, however, is that so many individuals work full time, play by the rules, and find themselves below the poverty level.

Currently, there are 2.5 million hourly minimum-wage workers, and 1.5 million more workers are paid less than the minimum wage and depend upon tips. From January 1981 to April 1990, the cost of living increased 48 percent while the minimum wage remained frozen at \$3.35 an hour. It is no wonder, then, that the number of working poor in this country has increased 44 percent between 1979 and 1992.

As a first step to giving value to work and to promote individual responsibility, we must increase the minimum wage.

An increase in the minimum wage is also an important component of welfare reform. Real welfare reform has the potential to move individuals and families from dependency toward lasting self-sufficiency. But meaningful welfare reform must be sensitive to both the realities of the job market and the difficulties faced by individuals when an individual is unable to work because of a disability or when dependent children require care.

If the goal of welfare reform is to move individuals from welfare to work, we need to ensure that an individual working full time will not fall below the poverty level. If we want to instill responsibility, we must ensure that the minimum wage is a livable wage.

The minimum wage is not just about our workers, it is also about our children. Some 58 percent of all poor children under six in 1992 had parents who worked full or part-time. The number of children in poverty increased from 5 to 6 million from 1987 to 1992. Some 18 percent of all poor children under 6 in 1992 lived with unmarried mothers who worked full-time.

An increase in the minimum wage is also necessary because the income gap between the wealthiest of our society and working Americans is growing. In fact, income inequality in this country is currently at its highest level since 1947.

As we move into the area of welfare reform, it is time to question old assumptions. We must ask the question: "Can we do it better?" I believe we can.

The majority currently advocates the block grant as a mechanism to reform our welfare system. But let us be very clear, block granting programs do not make the problems go away. It simply shifts responsibility to the States, and if a block grant is a way of simply saving money as opposed to providing adequate assistance to eligible individuals, then we are not doing the Governors

any favors. If we adopt a block grant approach, these grants must be flexible to adjust to changing local economic conditions.

Currently, funding for entitlement programs increased to meet demand during economic downturns when State budgets are financially strapped. Under discretionary block grant programs in a recession, sufficient money is unlikely to be available to meet the demand. While the number of people eligible to receive benefits will grow as the economy weakens, they will not necessarily be entitled to receive any support.

Because Federal funding for assistance would no longer automatically increase in response to greater need, States would have to decide whether to cut benefits, tighten eligibility, or dedicate their own revenues to these programs. The demand for assistance to help low-income Americans would be greatest at precisely the time when State economies are in recession and tax bases are shrinking.

A second issue that must be addressed in designing block grants is the formula by which funds are allocated. A formula that is based merely on historical data would not reflect economic and demographic changes. These changes must be reflected.

Another concern I have with block grants is the phenomenon of interstate competition, which may encourage a downward spiral in benefit levels and result in a race between States to the lowest benefit level. More than two dozen States have been granted waivers from the Federal Government to experiment with their welfare programs, and already State officials are expressing concern that welfare recipients will travel to their States if the benefits are reduced in neighboring States, and while we must be careful not to be overly prescriptive when it comes to designing block grants, we have a responsibility to ensure states are moving welfare recipients from welfare to work in providing a minimum level of support for their citizens.

We have begun an important debate. The present welfare system must change, but we must continue our commitment to providing all of our citizens an opportunity to support themselves.

I welcome the challenges in the days ahead during this crucial debate.

#### TRIBUTE TO KATE HANLEY ON HER ELECTION AS CHAIRMAN OF FAIRFAX COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, the first election of any consequence, maybe the only one, but there may be some that I have not heard about, but the first

election of any consequence since November 8 occurred this week, and guess what, a Democrat won.

Fairfax County is larger than any of our congressional districts. It has almost a million people. The chairman of the board of Fairfax County had been a Republican. He is now a colleague in the House of Representatives.

□ 1930

So there was a special election to fill his place. Kate Hanley, the Democrat, rose to the position of chairman of one of the largest counties in the country through the usual way. She had no bumper-strip slogans, there were no clichés in the campaign, she had been an officer of her civic association, president of her PTA, she had invested enormous amounts of time in child care, health care, transportation, she chaired the regional body which develops policy on transportation for the Washington region.

In other words, she had invested much of her adult life in serving her community.

She was not an advocate of no government or in any way suggested that government is the problem. In fact, what she would say time and again is that good government is the solution to the problems that we have in developing the kind of quality we want for ourselves and our families.

She was successful in that approach.

Mr. Speaker, this is a county that has one of the highest educational levels in the country, and people who are very much involved in civic activities. They agreed with her message, someone who has devoted themselves to the community, who believes in the spirit of community and believes in the Democratic Party's principles of opportunity, responsibility, and yes, community.

That is the kind of person they want to lead them.

So Kate Hanley was elected to chair the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, where many of us live.

I know all of us will benefit from the good government that Kate Hanley will bring to Fairfax County.

I do not know whether this is a harbinger of things to come; I would certainly like to think so. But it certainly is a testament to the fact that if you do things right, particularly when you localize elections to the point where you are offering yourself to people who know you, who know how much you care about their community and their quality of life, you can win.

Kate Hanley did win, and I applaud her for her commitment to her community and the fact that she was proud to run as a Democrat on Democratic principles.

She was victorious. I think we are going to see more victories like Kate Hanley's in Fairfax County.

#### LAWSUIT CHALLENGING THREE-FIFTHS VOTE TO INCREASE INCOME TAX RATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUNNINGHAM). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday 15 Members of this body, including myself, 6 private citizens, and the League of Women Voters filed a lawsuit to overturn as unconstitutional the new House rule requiring a supermajority of three-fifths to pass any legislation raising income tax rates.

Let me make this very, very clear: This lawsuit has absolutely nothing to do with taxes; it has everything to do with the Constitution of the United States.

Last month each and every one of us took an oath to uphold and defend that Constitution. That is our first and our most serious and sacred duty.

Unfortunately, the new House majority seems all too willing to treat the Constitution quite casually.

This new House rule is intended to be a political statement that they are really serious about not raising taxes. We believe that the Constitution is far too important to set aside just for the sake of a political slogan.

The new House rule violates one of the most fundamental principles of our democracy, the principle of majority rule. It sets an extremely dangerous precedent, and we simply believe that it should not be allowed to stand.

This year the supermajority requirement may apply just to income tax rates; but next year—next year it could be international agreements or trade or civil rights or clean air, and perhaps unanimous consent required if this country should have to go to war.

So it is extremely important to act now to purge the House rules of this very bad idea. To do it now, lest it serve as an invitation to some future Congress to do even more mischief with the Constitution, to yield to some temptation to an even greater level of constitutional stupidity.

The Framers of the Constitution were very much aware of the difference between a supermajority and a simple majority. They met in Philadelphia in direct response to the requirement of the Articles of Confederation for a supermajority to raise and spend money or exercise other major powers. It was the paralysis of our National Government in those days, caused by the supermajority requirement of the Articles of Confederation, more than any other single reason, that led to the creation of our Constitution.

In the convention in Philadelphia, the delegates repeatedly considered and rejected proposals to require a supermajority for action by Congress, either on all subjects or on specified ones. In only five instances did they specify something more than a regular majority vote: overriding a veto, ratifying a treaty, removing officials from

office, expelling a Member, or proposing amendments to the Constitution itself.

When they wanted to require supermajorities, they knew exactly how to do it. None of these instances have anything to do with the passage of legislation.

Now, some argue that the three-fifths requirement to raise taxes would be like the two-thirds requirement to pass a bill on suspension or 60-vote requirement to end debate in the other body. Wrong. Those rules address procedural steps. A bill not approved under suspension of the rules can be brought back and passed by a simple majority later in the House.

After a debate is over in the other body, the bill still needs to gather only a majority of votes to pass.

The idea of a three-fifths vote to raise taxes was first proposed by the new majority in its so-called contract as part of the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. For those who are serious about this idea, that is the way to do it, amending the Constitution itself. They cannot use the House rules to amend the Constitution on the cheap.

The Framers had the wisdom and foresight to grant the courts the authority to decide the constitutionality of the acts of other branches of the Government.

The Framers knew there would be times like this, times in our history when elected officials would be unable to resist the temptation to tamper with the Constitution.

Today we have taken advantage of that foresight by asking the Federal District Court for the District of Columbia to strike down this politically motivated House rule and to preserve the integrity of the Constitution.

Filing suit against the Clerk of the House is a step which none of us takes lightly. Last month I took an oath to uphold and defend the Constitution, and it is with deep respect for my colleagues in this body and my commitment to that oath I filed this suit.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I joined 14 other Members of Congress, 6 interested private citizens, and the League of Women Voters in filing a lawsuit to strike down a new House rule which violates the principle of majority rule. We have asked the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia to issue a declaratory judgment that the new House rule requiring a three-fifths vote to increase income tax rates is unconstitutional. The new rule violates one of the most fundamental principles of our democracy—majority rule—and it should not be allowed to stand.

I am especially pleased that Lloyd Cutler, Partner at Wilmer, Cutler, and Pickering, and Prof. Bruce Ackerman of the Yale Law School have agreed to represent us in this suit. Their expertise and commitment have been invaluable in making this challenge possible.

Let me make this clear, this case has nothing to do with taxes and everything to do with the Constitution. To make it look like they're really serious about opposing taxes, the new Republican majority is willing to subvert the