

issue of who may vote and where they may do it is at the very heart of our democratic system. Preserving the integrity of this process is critical. But, there is significant evidence that vote fraud is not a rare occurrence.

There is a much bigger picture involving voter fraud that we do not always read about. However, I would recommend to my colleagues that they read a well-written book, "Dirty Little Secrets," by Larry J. Sabato and Glenn R. Simpson. Mr. Sabato is a well respected political scientist at the University of Virginia and Mr. Simpson used to work for the bi-weekly paper on Capitol Hill, Roll Call. These two authors tackle numerous topics, including voter fraud. And it's scary.

Vote fraud issues include dead people voting, people being able to game the system and lousy verification procedures. The tale of how a person was able to register his dog by mail is one of my favorites.

The election registration process is generally handled at the state level. However, Congress asserted itself quite boldly when we passed the so-called "motor-voter" registration legislation, the National Voter Registration Act of 1993. This legislation requires states to establish motor registration procedures for federal elections so that eligible citizens may apply to register to vote (1) simultaneously with applying for a driver's license, (2) by mail, and (3) at selected state and local offices that serve the public. I certainly have no problem with making it easier for people to register to vote. Of course, if someone would not take the time to register to vote prior to the change, I question whether he or she would actually vote once registered, but that debate has already been had.

The question we must now face deal with the potential for fraud in voter registration. To quote Sabato and Simpson, "[v]oting fraud is back, is becoming more serious with each passing election cycle, and soon—because of the recent changes in the law—is destined to become even worse." The reason why motor-voter will make voting fraud an issue that we will not be able to ignore is the same reason why the bill was so popular: it makes it easier to register to vote. Any one of my colleagues could sit at home and mail in voter registration cards with different addresses with little problem. I could even register my dog. As I said, it's been done.

To relate this another way, when I am back home doing precinct walks, my campaign will purchase voter rolls and have them sorted by household. In the past, there used to be a few duplicates or outdated names on the list, but nothing overwhelming. Nowadays, it is not uncommon to see several different names listed for one address. These people may or may not have really lived at the address given, but certainly not all of them are living there now. The rolls are filled with outdated names and addresses. It is no longer an error here, an outdated address there. To put it in fiscal terms, in California alone, "deadwood" voters cause state and local governments to waste \$5 to \$8 million of taxpayers' money printing and mailing voter pamphlets, unneeded ballots, and the like.

The more we allow our voting rolls to get out of hand, the less secure our election system will be. Some of this can be done locally by improving databases or centralizing the system. However, the federal government can also allow state and local governments to use

a few tools at absolutely no cost to the taxpayer. This is what my legislation aims to do.

Mr. Speaker, the Florida State Association of Supervisors of Elections came to me toward the end of the 104th Congress with suggestions as to how the federal government can assist them in doing their jobs. I have turned their suggestions into the Integrity in Voter Registration Act. First, this bill would require applicants registering to vote in federal elections to provide their Social Security numbers. Second, a state would be allowed to remove a registrant's name from the list of eligible voters if the registrant has not voted in two consecutive federal general elections after having received a notice requesting confirmation of the registrant's address.

The Social Security number requirement would allow each person to have a unique identifier with their name. It would make it easier to spot duplicate registrations. The notification requirement gives guidance to states since federal law is currently a bit vague.

Mr. Speaker, this proposal was given to me by the Florida State Association of Supervisors of Elections and I have gotten letters from other people outside of Florida, including Texas and Illinois. These two changes would go a long way toward helping keep the voter rolls clean. Surely this is no silver bullet. Nothing is. But this proposal would make a serious dent in duplicative and sometimes fraudulent registrations, ensuring the integrity of our electoral system. I urge my colleagues to support the Integrity in Voter Registration Act.

THE CIDCARE ACT

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing CIDCARE, in an effort to effectively stimulate the demand for higher quality care for our Nation's children while simultaneously removing barriers and providing resources to improve the quality of child care in the United States.

Child care continues to be a worry for most families as stories continue to surface about the lack of quality child care. Moreover, research has clearly demonstrated that a high-quality child care program is one that makes the healthy development and education of children its first objective and strives to stimulate the learning process of all children through developmentally appropriate activities that foster social, emotional, and intellectual growth. In addition, families in today's society are increasingly required to have both parents enter the work force. The demand for quality child care is increasing as is the need for credentialed and accredited child care providers.

Accordingly, CIDCARE will stimulate the demand for higher quality child care for our Nation's children while simultaneously removing barriers and providing resources to improve the quality of child care in the United States.

Many of my colleagues may have read about the tragic circumstances surrounding the Fiedelhotz family in Florida. The Fiedelhotz' son Jeremy died after only 2 hours at a day care facility. Through this tragedy should have never happened, it is an unfortu-

nate example of what can and may continue to happen unless we encourage and inform all parents about the need for accredited and credentialed child care providers and facilities.

CIDCARE through the Tax Code will encourage the demand for accredited or credentialed child care. This will be accomplished in the following manner: First, by increasing the amount which an employee can contribute to a dependent care assistance plan if a child is in accredited or credentialed child care; second, changing the dependent care tax credit to allow parents to receive a higher and more equitable dependent day care credit; third, providing tax benefits for employers which provide quality child care; fourth, extending eligibility for businesses to take a qualified charitable deduction for the donation of educational equipment and materials to public schools, accredited or credentialed nonprofit child care providers; fifth, establishing a \$260 million competitive grant program to assist States in improving the quality of child care; sixth, expanding public information and technical assistance services to identify and disseminate to the public what is important for child development in child care; seventh, providing \$50 million to create and operate a technology-based training infrastructure to enable child care providers nationwide to receive the training, education, and support they need to improve the quality of child care; eighth, creating a child care training revolving fund to enable child care providers and child care support entities to purchase computers, satellite dishes, and other technological equipment which enable them to participate in the child care training provided on the national infrastructure; ninth, requiring that all Federal child care centers will have to meet all State and local licensing and other regulatory requirements related to the provision of child care, within 6 months of the passage of this legislation; and tenth, extending the Perkins and Stafford Loan Forgiveness Program to include child care workers who are employed full time providing child care services and have a degree in early childhood education or development or receive professional child care credentials.

I urge all of my colleagues to review this bill and to join me in cosponsoring this important measure. Our children are our future and we insist that they receive the best care possible, especially during their early development years.

Accordingly, I will welcome your support.

INTRODUCTION OF THE LEWIS AND CLARK RURAL WATER SYSTEM ACT OF 1999

HON. JOHN R. THUNE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, today I, along with my colleagues Representative MINGE from Minnesota and Representative LATHAM from Iowa, am pleased to introduce the Lewis and Clark Rural Water System Act of 1999. This legislation would authorize the construction of the Lewis and Clark Rural Water System which, when completed, will serve over 180,000 people in 22 communities, covering almost 5,900 square miles throughout South

Dakota, Minnesota, and Iowa. The project and legislation recognize the tremendous need the people of this region have for access to clean, safe, affordable drinking water. 1

The need for water development in South Dakota is great. In our state, water is a matter of health, economic development, and rural development. The ability of rural America to survive and grow is directly related to the ability of rural areas and growing communities to have access to adequate supplies of safe drinking water. Without a reliable supply of water, these areas cannot attract new businesses and cannot create jobs. In a rural state like South Dakota, the link between the creation of jobs and adequate water supplies cannot be emphasized enough.

Some cities and towns throughout the Lewis and Clark project region are preventing new building and development, just to preserve the existing water supplies. Because of these limitations, these same communities have permanent restrictions on the use of water for washing cars and watering the laws—something most of us take for granted. Further, over 75 percent of the population relies upon shallow wells and limited water supplies, posing the risk of exposing these residents to dangerous levels of contamination. Each of these factors point to the strong need for a comprehensive, regional solution to meet this most basic of needs.

The people of these three great states recognized this same need when they organized to form the Lewis and Clark Rural Water System almost nine years ago in 1990. Since that time, they have worked tirelessly to see their dream of clean, safe water become a reality. The project has been supported strongly by all three states, with the South Dakota legislature having already committed \$400,000 to Lewis and Clark. The state legislatures of Minnesota and Iowa have authorized similar levels of support. The support of the Members of this body who represent the Lewis and Clark service area further demonstrates the regional cooperation at play. The regional approach offered by the Lewis and Clark System maximizes the number of people that can be served, and it also serves to offer the most cost-efficient manner to provide water.

This legislation, originally introduced in the 104th Congress and reintroduced in the 105th Congress, has been the subject of numerous hearings in the House and Senate and countless hours of discussions and negotiations between the project sponsors, the Administration, and many of our colleagues in Congress. Last September, the Senate companion bill met important success in its approval by the full Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee. I am optimistic that we will see similar action on this important legislation here in the House.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to reiterate the importance of this vital project. People most familiar with the project have clearly seen that the need for water is great and indisputable. Likewise, the roll of the federal government in both participation and funding rural water supply has been set by numerous and lengthy historical precedents. Now it is up to the House to respond to this need. Congress has the opportunity to do so by supporting this important piece of legislation and moving forward with plans that will allow over 180,000 hard-working taxpayers the opportunity to turn on their taps and receive what

many of us take for granted—a cool glass of clean, fresh water.

I look forward to working with each of you in seeing this dream for many South Dakotans, Minnesotans, and Iowans come to fruition.

YOUTH TOBACCO POSSESSION PREVENTION ACT

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing the Youth Tobacco Possession Prevention Act today because I believe we have fallen well short of our responsibility to protect children from tobacco marketing. Last year, we considered a variety of “comprehensive” solutions to reverse the trend of youth smoking—all of which failed.

Now that the States have settled their cases with the tobacco companies, it is even less likely that the federal government will pass such broad legislation. However, there is one very important issue that still needs to be addressed that could significantly reduce the number of youth smokers is the issue of youth possession of tobacco products.

It is estimated that 3,000 young people start smoking every day. Worse yet, one third, or 1,000 of these people will eventually die from tobacco related disease. Consider the emotional and financial strain these horrible situations will place on American families in the future. In response to this national crisis, the public health community, State attorneys general, the U.S. Congress and even the tobacco industry proposed a variety of methods to reduce youth smoking rates during the 105th Congress.

Most of the proposals would have spent money on counteradvertising, tobacco cessation programs and tobacco education programs—all worthy and necessary components of comprehensive tobacco legislation. However, the leadership of the American government has been sending a mixed signal to America's youth and nothing in the proposed settlement would change this.

Under current law, it is illegal to sell tobacco products to anyone under the age of 18 in all 50 States. However, if a person under the age of 18 is somehow able to obtain tobacco products—which it is painfully clear they are easily able to do—there are only a few States that have enacted laws regarding the possession of tobacco by these young people. I find it incredibly hypocritical that we, as a government (either Federal or State), are so willing to make buying tobacco illegal but are virtually silent on possessing tobacco.

Despite the strides that were been made by the recent states settlement, this is still a huge problem. Barely half of the states have enacted tobacco possession laws that actually make it illegal for someone under the age of 18 to possess tobacco products.

The Youth Tobacco Possession Prevention Act will help solve this problem. There are two key components to this bill. First, in dealing with the youth, it focuses on education rather than punishment. For first and second time offenders, youth will be required to complete tobacco education and cessation programs, as

well as tobacco related community service. If they continue to disregard the law and their health, their driver's license would be suspended from three to six months. This last resort was suggested during one of our Subcommittee hearings by a local teenager, who told the Commerce Health Subcommittee that kids would only respond to this type of approach.

Second, the bill would require States to enact stern punishments for people over the age of 18 who provide tobacco products to youth. At that same hearing, many of our teen witnesses admitted one of the primary sources of tobacco are older people who buy for teens. This is simply not acceptable. I believe every adult has the responsibility and moral obligation to do whatever we can to prevent our nation's youth from starting this deadly habit.

Unlike many proposals, this bill will not punish States who choose not to enact the outlined legislation. It will, however, reward those States which act responsibly and do. Each State that passes the provisions outlined in this bill will receive 5 additional points on their Health and Human Services competitive public health service grant applications. This incentive will hopefully encourage States to take action and do the right thing.

THE LIBERTAD ENFORCEMENT ACT

HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the LIBERTAD Enforcement Act and to reflect on the actions of the Clinton Administration toward Cuba.

Just yesterday, January 5th, the President announced several new measures to “assist and support the Cuban people without strengthening the regime.” While I understand that the regulations regarding these measures have not been developed, I am concerned about the proposal that would allow sales of food and agricultural inputs. Not only is it unclear whether President Clinton has the authority to make this change, but it is unlikely at this point that these sales would have much effect on the Cuban people, who it is designed to help. Without a private sector and very few non-governmental organizations, it will be difficult to get food to the people and keep it from Castro and his regime.

Cuba has been a dictatorship under Fidel Castro for some 40 years. During that time I think the world is fully aware of the many human rights violations this dictator has committed and his regime has committed. I think the world is probably also fully aware that Cuba and Fidel Castro remain only one of two Communist dictatorships left after the fall of the Soviet Union and changes around the world and tendencies towards more democracies, as we have seen in the last decade or so.

We have tried numerous times in small, incremental ways, to either oust Fidel Castro or to change his policies. It should be abundantly clear to anyone who has observed this man over the years that he is not about to change his stripes. He is not about to give up his ruthless power. And if he does, it will not be voluntarily.