

look at exactly what community policing does for our towns and cities.

Community policing works, and it works because it asks the experts to create crime-fighting strategies.

When I say experts, I am not talking about bureaucrats in Washington offices. When I say experts, I am talking about the people who actually live in the neighborhoods plagued with crime. I am talking about the police officers who patrol these neighborhoods every day.

So when the crime bill says it will put 100,000 new community police officers on the beat, we must remember that these officers will know both the neighborhoods they patrol and the people in them.

I talk from experience. I served on the city council of the city of San Diego for 5 years. San Diego is the sixth largest city in the Nation.

My district, both on the city council and in Congress, includes some of the poorest areas of our city, areas which both have high crime and also a traditional fear of and hostility toward police officers.

Yet we established in those areas of highest crime and highest fear walking patrol teams, teams of police officers who got to know their communities and the communities got to know the cops.

They all had beepers that could be paged at any time. They all had first names, which the residents knew, and they got to know the kids in the community. They got to know the storekeepers in the community.

□ 1950

They got to know the seniors. They knew where people lived and worked and played, and a confidence developed.

I tell the Members, I am one of the few city councilmen in this Nation, I thought, that could walk into a meeting of people in my district, working people, poor people, and the cops would get a standing ovation from those residents, because they had established the trust. They had established the confidence.

Mr. Speaker, I have worked hand-in-hand with neighborhood residents and community policing teams. I have seen the effect this partnership has had in reducing crime. The police officers become real human beings, and the cops become real human beings. They are there working together.

Mr. Speaker, the first year we established in San Diego the walking teams, crime went down a minimum of 10 percent in every major category. However, more than this, more than the rate going down, fear went down in those communities. The community got involved in fighting the crime. The cops had a stake in that community. The cops felt accountable. There were real, objective reasons why the crime rate went down.

Yes, we need to be tough on crime. We need stiffer penalties. We need to make sure criminals serve their full

sentences. However, we also need to work together as communities.

What the crime bill proved last year was that Congress was serious about fighting crime. We had enough foresight to make it a comprehensive fight and a comprehensive effort.

Mr. Speaker, let us not move backward from this effort. Let us understand the central role of community policing in fighting crime. Let us join together to oppose any cuts in these critical programs. It works.

The people have confidence in their police force. The police force know the people they are working with and protecting. The crime rate goes down, and community spirit goes up. Let us keep it.

THE MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLUG). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, this Congress should affirm work more by our actions than our words.

At the current minimum wage rate of \$4.25 an hour, a full-time year-round worker earns \$8,500 per year. The President announced his plan last week to raise the minimum wage 45 cents a year over a 2-year period, bringing the wage to a \$5.15 an hour rate by 1997. A 90-cent per hour increase in the minimum wage means an additional \$1,800 per year in the worker's pay check—as much as the average family spends on groceries in over 7 months. Such increases are significant and should be implemented by this body without hesitation.

Sixty percent of all minimum wage workers are women—most of whom are trying to raise a family as a single parent. People who work 40 hours a week, 52 weeks a year should not be living in poverty. When citizens take responsibility to work full-time, they should be able to raise a family on their wages. We have begun to take up the issue of welfare reform, but if we refuse to make work pay, how will our arguments be effective? Who can afford to listen?

While considering these increases, I am cautious not to upset the balance between the needs of the workers and the economic means of the small business owners. I believe that small businesses are the backbone of this Nation and I would never want to move forward with a proposal that would severely paralyze productivity or adversely affect profit margins. I am confident, though, that raising the minimum wage will do no harm to either, because I believe we should carefully assess any other burdens proposed for such businesses so as not to burden them twice.

Adjusted for inflation, the value of the minimum wage has fallen by nearly 50 cents since 1991, and is now 27 percent lower than it was in 1979. We must

bring these wages back up to a respectable level. We must reward hard work with fair wages. We must take pride in our workers' skills and empower them to be a contributing force in our Nation's growing economy. Prosperity should not be reserved for an elite few—it belongs to all of America's working-class.

Let us keep this in mind when considering the arguments for and against increasing the minimum wage. We should not make this debate more difficult than it needs to be, because despite current posturing, increasing the minimum wage traditionally garners bipartisan support. Although President Bush did not support the measure, the 1989 vote to increase the minimum wage was passed 382 to 37 in the House and 89 to 9 in the Senate. With Presidential support this round, I hope the numbers will continue to enjoy such company in this Congress. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of the proposal to raise the minimum wage.

COMMUNITY POLICING WORKS TO LOWER CRIME

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

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] for arranging for those of us whose experience has been in the field of law enforcement prior to our duties in the Congress to come and express this evening, and for some time in the evenings in the future, our concerns about what we see as perhaps the direction in the new crime bill, as part of the Contract for America, that may do some serious damage to some of the good things this Congress did last year.

Mr. Chairman, tonight a couple of my colleagues have already addressed the issue of community policing. I want to join them this evening. Before I came to the House of Representatives, I served for 8 years as an elected district attorney in a rural district in northeast Texas.

In that job, I found two things to be true: one, that the best deterrent to criminal conduct was effective prosecution, the certainty of punishment; and even more importantly, the presence of law enforcement on our streets, in our communities, all over the country.

Mr. Speaker, last year's crime bill provides for 100,000 new cops on the beat in a community policing effort. I don't know any law enforcement official that would not tell the Members that one of the most effective things we can do or they can do or anyone can do to fight crime in America is to increase the presence of police on our streets.

You don't have high crime where you have a high number of police officers. You don't have folks breaking into homes if they know the policeman may walk by in the next few minutes. You

have a lower incidence of crime where you have a higher presence of police.

Mr. Speaker, in our State just about 4 years ago, in the city of Houston, a mayoral candidate ran on the platform that he would dramatically increase the size of the Houston Police Department if he was elected, and he did so. In that city, the violent crime rate decreased in 1 year by 27 percent. Crime went down all over the city of Houston, and the mayor was recently reelected with one of the largest percentages of any big city mayor in the country.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell the Members that the new cops program is going to work because I have been there and I know, and so will every law enforcement association in America who have endorsed this program and who share our concerns with the direction of turning everything in the arena of law enforcement into some kind of block grant, where we send a check from Washington and just trust the folks at home to know what to do with it.

Our cities, our communities, our neighbors, our homes, our schools deserve to have the very best that we can offer. One of the good things Congress did last year in passing the crime bill was to put the cops on the beat, 100,000. We say without understanding, sometimes, "What does 100,000 new policemen mean?"

□ 2000

When you think in the context that in our country we only have about 600,000 police officers, what it means is a 17 percent increase in the number of policemen in our communities, on the streets, in the patrol cars, working with our kids, working in the schools, working to make sure that our neighborhoods are safe.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we do not undo the good we did. Clearly there are some things in the crime bill that we can improve on. I hope we do that in this debate and the votes that we will face in the days and weeks ahead. But one of the things that Congress did right, joining together in a bipartisan way, was to put the cops program in place.

Given a chance to work, that program will reduce crime, increase the confidence of American citizens in their police, will increase the assurance that those who violate the law will pay the price. It is a good policy, it is a good program, it is one that is working and it is one we ought to keep.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we do not undo the good things we have done.

DISENFRANCHISING CONGRESS

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, during the debate earlier today on the line-item veto, Members were not permitted to strike the requisite number of words and speak before the vote. And therefore I want to take this opportunity to

put my thoughts on in terms of the vote that just happened.

I voted against the line-item veto. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I believe we in this Congress are going to rue the day that we voted for the line-item veto, and as was said many times by many colleagues, this line-item veto, in my opinion, is nothing more than an unconstitutional ceding of power to the executive branch.

I believe that in order for a line-item veto to be put forward we need a constitutional change, and therefore, a constitutional amendment, and surely when there is a legal challenge to the line-item veto I believe it will ultimately be declared unconstitutional without a constitutional amendment.

Congress is granted the power of the purse. I do not believe Congress has the right to cede that power to the Executive.

This to me has nothing to do with partisan politics, it has nothing to do with Congress being controlled by the Democrats or the Republicans or the President being a Democrat or a Republican. It simply to me reflects the very serious nature that I feel about our Constitution. I feel it is a very sacred document and I do not think any vote of Congress ought to be allowed to alter that.

Much is said today about this being President Reagan's birthday and the gesture of passing this on his birthday, but I must say with all due respect to President Reagan, he was President for 8 years, and while he talked about the importance of a line-item veto in terms of bringing the budget deficit down, he never once in his 8 years as President submitted a balanced budget to Congress. President Bush in 4 years in the Presidency never submitted a balanced budget to Congress.

So I think this fervor that people are rushing toward in terms of both the balanced budget amendment and the line-item veto is a bit misplaced.

What also scares me, Mr. Speaker, is that now if this becomes law, and the Senate concurs, two-thirds will have to pass something to override the President's veto.

I think that is very, very dangerous. It means simply that the President, plus one-third, plus one, of either House, would have control not just over entire spending bills, but each detail within them. To me that is a huge increase in Presidential power, and an increase in Presidential power, I might add, not just to affect the composition of spending, but also to punish and reward.

Simply put, the President might send to the Senate certain nominees to be confirmed and might make it very, very clear that unless his putting forth the line-item veto was sustained, that Congress would be in big trouble in terms of the confirmation. In other words, unless the Senate confirmed the Presidential appointments, the President might line-item veto certain appropriations.

So the President could use the line-item veto not only to stop spending, but can use it as a wedge over the heads of Congress to say if you do not do what I want, I am going to line-item veto what you want.

When there are negotiations between the executive branch and the legislative branch, Mr. Speaker, everyone knows how negotiations go, be they labor-management negotiations or any other kind. Baseball is now on strike and owners and players in negotiations whenever there is a settlement there is give and take on each side, each side gives a little, each side accepts a little bit of the other person's side, and they come out with a final document that may not be to everyone's liking, but it is a compromise document.

Now if the President has a line-item veto, what will happen I fear is when Congress and the President sit down and each gives a little, the little that the Congress gives to the President will be sustained, and the little that the President gives to the Congress will be line-item vetoed, altering the balance.

I want to just read in conclusion the first paragraph from the editorial of the Washington Post last week entitled "Disenfranchising Congress," and I will put the entire editorial in the RECORD, but I want to just conclude by reading this first paragraph. It says,

The version of the line-item veto now on the floor of the House is dangerous legislation. Too little attention has been paid to what it would do. It would likely do very little to reduce unnecessary spending and the deficit, the stated purpose. It would, however, transfer an enormous amount of power from Congress to the President, which the President could use for other purposes. It would also greatly strengthen congressional minorities at the expense of majority rule. That threatens to become a pattern: the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution that the House approved last week would also disenfranchise the majority.

I am sorry to say, Mr. Speaker I think with the passage of this, it is a very sad day for our country and I believe that those of us who voted no will be proven right in the future.

The text of the article referred to is as follows:

DISENFRANCHISING CONGRESS

The version of the line-item veto now on the floor of the House is dangerous legislation. Too little attention has been paid to what it would do. It would likely do very little to reduce unnecessary spending and the deficit, the stated purpose. It would, however, transfer an enormous amount of power from Congress to the president, which the president could use for other purposes. It would also greatly strengthen congressional minorities at the expense of majority rule. That threatens to become a pattern; the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution that the House approved last week would also disenfranchise the majority.

There's a better way to give the president line-item veto authority, which Reps. Bob Wise, Charles Stenholm and John Spratt are offering as an amendment, and which Budget Committee Chairman Pete Domenici supports in the Senate. The House should adopt this benign version.