

black and white church leaders have been motivated by prosperity's contradictions and united by the biblical imperatives of compassion and justice. Around the country, faith-based initiatives to overcome poverty show remarkable progress. But the president-elect needs to send an early signal about poor children and families being high on his agenda.

Bush asked theological questions such as, "What is justice?" That is a key question, especially amid fears that an emphasis on faith-based initiatives will be used to substitute for governmental responsibilities. We told him that in forging new partnerships to reduce poverty, the religious community will not only be service providers but prophetic interrogators. Our vocation is to ask why people are poor, and not just to care for the forgotten. Shelters and food banks aren't enough. We need solutions to the many problems of poverty, a pragmatic approach that produces results.

Could our divided political leaders rally around the moral cause of using our prosperity to finally address this nation's shamefully high poverty levels, especially among children? Could this divided nation find common ground if politicians would collaborate across old barriers, as religious leaders have begun to do?

Since neither party has succeeded in breaking the grip of persistent poverty, isn't a bipartisan effort called for? Republicans preaching compassionate conservatism and family values, Democrats fighting for poor working families and a religious community ready to lead by example; these forces could do something significant about poverty.

It is an encouraging sign that the president-elect is reaching out to begin discussions with leaders of faith-based initiatives. "I hope you surprise us," I told him afterward. We'll see; for now, the ball is in both our courts.

INTRODUCTION OF A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT PROVIDING FOR THE DIRECT ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

HON. WILLIAM D. DELAHUNT

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 2001

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to abolish the electoral college and provide for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President of the United States.

Until our recent national crash course in the federal election process, most Americans saw the Electoral College as a harmless anachronism. But 10 days ago, for the first time in over a century, the nation watched as the oath of office was administered to an elected president who failed to secure a plurality of the votes cast. The Constitution is clear, and I do not question the lawfulness or legitimacy of electing a president under these circumstances. Indeed, I join all patriotic citizens in wishing our new president well. But we must also ask—as many of my constituents have—whether an electoral system that negates the votes of half a million citizens is compatible with democratic values. This is not a partisan question. Indeed, I first raised it on

the eve of the election, when it looked as though the shoe might be on the other foot—when many were predicting that the candidate of my own party might prevail with a minority of the popular vote. And the answer to that question is far more important than the political fortunes of any one candidate or party.

The Electoral College presents a troubling contradiction for our democracy in at least two respects. First, and most obviously, it cannot be squared with the principle of majority rule. To award the presidency to the loser of the popular vote undermines respect for the system and compromises the new president's mandate to govern.

Second, the Electoral College is inconsistent with the principle of "one person, one vote". This is because the system by which electors are assigned gives disproportionate weight to less populous states. Massachusetts has one electoral vote for every 500,000 people, while Wyoming has one for every 160,000. In other words, a vote cast in Wyoming counts three times as much as a vote cast in Massachusetts.

Some defend the Electoral College because it carries the weight of constitutional authority. I agree that the Constitution should be amended only rarely and with great care. But the system designed by the framers for electing the president has already been amended, by the 12th and 22nd Amendments. And until ratification of the 17th Amendment in 1913, the U.S. Senate was elected not by the people, but by state legislatures. Few would argue that the original purpose of the Electoral College retains any relevance today. It reflected a mistrust of the electorate which we no longer endorse—the same mistrust that denied the people the right to elect their senators, and withheld the vote altogether from women, African-Americans and persons who did not own property.

Far from embodying some essential constitutional principle, the Electoral College was a political compromise, born of an era in which the states were 13 separate sovereignties determined to defend their interests. While regional differences have not disappeared, they have been greatly diluted by the growth of a common national identity. After 200 years of migration of people and ideas, the states themselves are far more heterogeneous, and far more similar, than when the compromise was struck.

While admitting that the original justification for the Electoral College no longer exists, its defenders claim that it serves some other, modern purpose. They argue, for example, that without the Electoral College, candidates will campaign only in major population centers, ignoring more sparsely populated regions. Yet even the residents of rural states tend to live within close proximity to a major metropolitan area. And even if their fears were to materialize, it is hard to see how this would be worse than the targeted campaigning in which the candidates recently engaged, writing off whole sections of the country and concentrating only on the so-called "battleground states." With every vote in play, candidates would no longer have an incentive to take anyone for granted. Others contend that abolishing the Electoral College would further undermine the stability and finality of the elec-

toral process. They point out that Florida's was not the only state race to be decided by a very small margin, and argue that if every vote were to count equally, recounts and court challenges would proliferate. Yet wouldn't this be likelier to happen if the Electoral College is retained? Without it, state wins and losses would no longer have electoral significance. All that would matter is the nationwide count.

Let's not forget that what happened in Florida was only a glimpse of the problems the Electoral College can cause. Had neither candidate received the required 270 electoral votes, the election would have been thrown into the House of Representatives—where the controversy could have taken weeks or months longer to resolve. I am under no illusion about the difficulty of enacting a constitutional amendment. But now is the time to act—while the memory of our recent experience is fresh. Congress has considered Electoral College reform before—but only when spurred on by electoral crises. The Senate held hearings in 1992, when it seemed that the Perot candidacy might deadlock the Electoral College. After George Wallace ran as a third-party candidate in 1968, the House actually approved a constitutional amendment, but it fell victim to a Senate filibuster.

We shouldn't wait for the next crisis before confronting the problem. There have been several thoughtful proposals to reform the Electoral College without a constitutional amendment, and they deserve a hearing. My own view, however, is that halfway measures cannot address the fundamental contradiction which the Electoral College represents in a mature democracy. That's why the bill I am introducing today would abolish it outright. Public officials, from selectmen to senators, are chosen by majority vote. That's the way it's supposed to work in a democracy. And that's how we should elect the president of the greatest democracy on earth.

CHRISTIANS THANK SIKHS IN INDIA: DR. GURMIT SINGH AULAKH COMMENDED

HON. DAN BURTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 2001

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on January 17 a group of Christians in India known as the Persecuted Church of India issued a statement commending the protection that Sikhs have provided to Christians in India from Indian government persecution.

Father Dominic Immanuel appeared on Star News to thank the Sikhs community for protecting Christians from Indian government persecution. As you know, the Christians in India have undergone a wave of violence and terror by militant Hindu nationalists associated with the pro-Fascist RSS, the parent organization of the ruling BJP. This violence has taken the form of church burnings, rape of nuns, murders of priests, and attacks on Christian schools and prayer halls. Graham Staines and his two little boys were burned to death in their jeep while they slept. Earlier, in 1997, police broke up a Christian religious festival with