

the mission of the Royaumont Process is the statement adopted earlier this month in Oslo by business representatives from the Turkish-Cypriot and Greek-Cypriot communities.

The fundamental thrust of the declaration is to encourage "increased contact and cooperation between two communities", including the relaxation and eventual removal of all restrictions on the free movement of people, goods and service and the expansion of contacts in business, culture and sports.

I am sure that everyone attending this conference could offer other illustrations of how nongovernmental organizations are, in a variety of ways engaged in efforts that involve men and women of different ethnic, religious and national backgrounds and are thereby laying the building blocks of the peaceful, stable region we all want to see.

As I have said, the Board of the Center will certainly want to cooperate with the Royaumont Process, and I salute Dr. Roumeliotis, Dr. Korliras and the other organizers of this conference for bringing together so many representatives of NGOs from so many different countries and cultures but all with an interest in the development of a vigorous and vital civil society.

Allow me then to indicate what I believe should be three goals of non-governmental organizations in this region, three crucial elements in developing the institutions and practices of self government: civil society, security and economic development.

First, a healthy, vibrant civil society—that is to say, institutions, associations and organizations wholly independent of government, groups through which the bonds of social trust and collaboration are created—is imperative if people are peacefully to express their differences and resolve their disputes.

A second essential criterion for democracy to take hold is a regional security regime—meaning a cluster of agreements among states to consult with, and provide their neighbors information about, their defense practices, and to agree on principles on which their security policies should be based. Such agreements and assurances are imperative not only for the immediate task of crisis prevention but also for the longer-term goal of helping generate such effective dialogue and understanding among peoples as to diminish persistent stereotypes of one another. If extremely difficult to establish, this factor is nonetheless crucial because no enduring solution to the security problems of the area can rely solely on the continued presence of the United States or Western Europe.

Third, the growth across borders of economic ties and the integration of markets can be a powerful incentive to the construction of open, pluralistic relations both within countries and throughout Southeastern Europe.

Business and trade associations, for example, can promote legal reforms that are conducive to freer internal markets as well as stronger commercial ties across frontiers. For indispensable to the long-term growth of domestic economies and trade among nations is the rule of law. Business executives and investors must be able to depend on agreed rules and their effective enforcement.

I must in this connection, say a special word about corruption, which could be the subject of an entire speech! In the last few years, corruption, long tolerated with apathy, cynicism and denial, has become a target of serious action both national and international levels.

Theft, bribery and money-laundering are now more and more understood to be major obstacles to economic growth and genuine democracy. Even as 34 nations last year signed the OECD Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials, I believe attention must be paid to the challenge of

corruption in the new democracies of Southeastern Europe. Another item for the agenda of our Center!

If I have not yet exhausted you, I shall conclude these remarks by proposing some questions for our discussion in the next two days:

What kinds of voluntary, non-governmental associations are most needed in your respective states in Southeastern Europe?

What is the role of the region's major religions with respect to crafting democracy here?

What about the obligation of the media—press, television, radio—in stimulating a sense of civic responsibility and genuine accountability by government to the citizenry? How can we assure media free of government control?

How can schools, colleges and universities encourage respect for people of different ethnic origins, nationalities and religions? How can educational institutions promote understanding of the nature of democracy?

How can new cultural, economic, educational and social linkages be created to replace old ethnic and religious divisions?

Ladies and gentlemen, I have spoken of some of the factors that seem to me essential to overcoming, or at least diminishing, the many conflicts in this region and to building societies at once peaceful, democratic and stable.

And allow me to say once more how deeply impressed I am by the initiative of the Royaumont Process and its collaborators in sponsoring this conference.

I hope that the Center for Democracy and Reconciliation of which I have told you will have a long and productive relationship not only with Royaumont, but also with the many non-governmental organizations represented here this week.

How splendid it would be, as we look to a new century and the next millennium, for all the peoples of Southeastern Europe to enjoy the fruits of freedom, democracy and the rule of law!

A SPECIAL TRIBUTE TO MARTHA
L. BUTLER FOR HER EXEM-
PLARY SERVICE TO THE OHIO
SENATE

HON. PAUL E. GILLMOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1998

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay very special tribute to an outstanding individual from the Great State of Ohio, Martha L. Butler. Later this month, after thirteen years of service, Martha Butler will retire from her prestigious position of Clerk of the Ohio Senate.

Martha's initial service to the Ohio Senate began more than twenty-five years ago when she began working as an aide to the Honorable Max H. Dennis. During her early years in the Senate, her commitment to the institution of the Senate and professionalism she brought to her job were evident to all of those who had the opportunity to work with her. In 1977, she switched Senate offices and began working for the Honorable Paul E. Pfeifer as his Legislative Aide.

A short time later, Martha moved to the Senate Clerk's office where she became the Assistant Clerk of the Ohio Senate. Then, in 1985, Martha broke new ground and made history by becoming the first woman to hold the position of Clerk in the Ohio Senate. In

fact, Martha is the only woman to hold this position in either chamber of the Ohio Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, during the time when I served as the President of the Ohio Senate and in most of my twenty-two years as a State Senator, I was very fortunate to have the opportunity to work closely with Martha. She approached her work in the Ohio Senate with the highest sense of honor, responsibility, and dedication. In the future, the unwavering commitment and professionalism that Martha brought to the Office of the Clerk will be the standard by which all others who hold that position will be judged.

Mr. Speaker, having had the pleasure of working with Martha Butler and seeing, firsthand, her commitment to the people of the state of Ohio, I know she will be sorely missed. Martha truly is a credit to the Ohio Senate, and to all of Ohio. I would urge my colleagues to stand and join me in paying special tribute to Martha Butler, and in wishing her well in all of her future endeavors.

BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN
INTEGRITY ACT OF 1997

SPEECH OF

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1998

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2183) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reform the financing of campaigns for elections for Federal office, and for other purposes:

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, on July 20, 1998, Mr. GOODLATTE of Virginia offered an amendment to the Shays-Meeham campaign finance reform substitute that proposed repealing important provisions of the 1993 National Voter Registration Act. Fortunately, this ill-considered amendment to gut what has become known as the "Motor Voter law" was defeated. In his remarks supporting Mr. GOODLATTE's amendment, Mr. DELAY of Texas cited Dr. Walter Dean Burnham, a professor of Government at the University of Texas at Austin and a nationally recognized expert on the history of American campaigns and elections. On page H5941, Mr. DELAY states: "Because of the lack of fraud provisions in the Motor Voter law, 'We have the modern world's sloppiest electoral systems,' according to political scientist Walter Dean Burnham."

In a letter to the Committee on House Oversight, Dr. Burnham writes that Mr. DELAY misquoted him and misrepresented the substance of his research on voting. His letter follows:

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN,
DEPARTMENT OF GOVERNMENT,

Austin, TX, July 27, 1998.

Dr. KEITH ABOUCHAR

*Committee on Oversight, Democratic Staff,
House of Representatives, Longworth House
Office Bldg., Washington, DC.*

DEAR KEITH: Thanks very much for the fax of July 21 and the enclosed CR remarks on the Goodlatte Amendment.

It will probably not surprise you to learn that I was grossly misquoted by Rep. DeLay. Some years ago, I was indiscreet enough to respond to a phone inquiry from some writer

for the Readers' Digest who, it turned out, was a strong opponent of the Motor Voter Act—which of course I warmly supported. The slant given on my views there was bad enough, but I have to regard myself as an inadvertent unindicted co-conspirator in that case.

My major theme was—and is—that for a country which prides itself on its democratic institutions the United States (or, more precisely, the states and localities chiefly responsible for election laws) is remarkable for long adhering to the view, implicitly, that voting is a privilege requiring justification before some official rather than, as elsewhere in the Western world, a right which the state does its very best to protect. The theoretical issues here are thoroughly canvassed in any essay on a case from Texas involving that state's 1966 voter-registration act that I produced in the 1971 Washington University Law Quarterly.

The sloppiness in election administration to which I refer in particular has nothing to do with the Motor Voter Act as DeLay sloppily claims: it seems endemic in a great many locations (though by no means all), and it goes back a long way. We will leave aside cases of outright swamping of the process by massive corruption, of the sort that prompted a Republican Senate to refuse to seat two apparent Republican winners that year (Frank Smith of Illinois, William S. Vare of Pennsylvania). One sees examples of it most clearly, perhaps, when contested elections develop—such as the 1950 and 1952 gubernatorial races in Michigan; or the 1960 House race in the 5th Indiana, where the Democrat was finally declared the winner by a margin of 99 votes out of 214.5 thousand votes cast (the 1996 Sanchez-Dornan election in the 46th California has its precedents!); and some surveys of Texas elections as well, as *e.g.*, in 1968). From this record, one derives the general sense not that excessive corruption was in play (as in the 1926 Senate cases), but rather that administrative incompetence on a scale which W. Europe or Canada would not tolerate (and do not have) makes the results of a great many American elections mere approximations to the actual votes cast for the various candidates. Various misfires of punch-card and machine systems for casting votes in such places as Detroit and Cleveland in the 1970s merely reinforce this impression.

One obvious solution to this problem, so far as such efforts to ameliorate the turnout-depression caused by personal registration systems as the Motor Voter of 1993 are concerned, would be to say that you simply can't get there from here and to urge the view that it multiplies the occasions for unqualified people to cast ballots and should be repealed. Naturally, conservatives favor this, for they have systematically used the corruption/fraud argument for decades to defeat any efforts to make it easier for people to have access to the polls. One may note the roll-call votes on passage of this act as a recent example of this. Obviously, believing as I do that the European-British-Canadian arrangements for state enrollment of eligible voters correspond to my belief that voting is a right and not a privilege, if I had my way I would declare personal registration ipso facto as unconstitutional; but no Supreme Court I can imagine in my foreseeable future is likely to agree with me.

The alternative solution, it seems to me, is to invest in developing an election-administration bureaucracy which can competently and speedily count the votes cast and publish the results. This does not resolve the personal-registration problem, but is enforceably carried out should minimize the extent of sloppiness that evidently now exists.

That, and that alone, is my position. A nation will choose to make investments where the organized will to do so exists. So far as elections are concerned, it has to be said that there is no consensus at the end of the day that voting is properly regarded as an attribute of adult citizenship and thus as much of a civil right as those that have since 1954 been enforced by the courts. We are still, if obscurely, fighting the epic battle between General Ireton and Colonel Rainborough in the British Putney Debates of 1647. That battle was terminated ages ago in the rest of the Western world; and the contrasting modes of election administration simply attest on both sides to this fact.

It should go without saying that the ongoing collapse of voter participation in American elections outside of the South since 1960 has little enough to do with personal-registration requirements as such. For they were much less user-friendly in a great many states in 1960 than in 1996, and yet non-southern turnout topped 70% in the former year, compared with 53% or thereabouts in 1996. Given the general situation surrounding the 1998 election, I would guess that when we finally get the final totals sometime around April 1999, we will find that turnout for the US House will fall to somewhere around one-third of the potential electorate (from 38% in 1994) and, as such, will display the lowest level of participation among the potential electorate since 1798. All I can say in conclusion is that I like to do my little bit to make democracy live in the United States, and express my firm conviction that—whether we look at election administration or at the campaign-finance imbroglio—the present leadership and followership among the Republican majority in Congress seem to have other objectives.

Yours very truly,

WALTER DEAN BURNHAM,

Professor.

P.s.—Now this is something I would be happy to have entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD!

“VI NGUYEN—THE FUTURE OF MEDICAL RESEARCH”

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1998

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker and Colleagues, I rise before you today to praise Vi Nguyen from my district who recently completed the National Institutes of Health (NIH) Undergraduate Scholarship Program for Individuals from Disadvantaged Backgrounds (UGSP). The NIH 10-week summer research program is open only to scholars who have either a 3.5 grade point average or are in the top 5 percent of their class. To be eligible, candidates must also be committed to pursuing a career in biomedical research. The UGSP was set up for students who might not traditionally have research training opportunities. It was designed to improve access to undergraduate education that leads to careers in biomedical research, and to nurture scholarship recipients' interest in the NIH for their research training after graduation.

Vi is only one of 24 scholars selected in a nationwide competition for this prestigious program, and her journey to NIH this summer has been a long one. Her parents immigrated from Vietnam to San Diego, where she graduated from Bonita Vista High School. Her interest in

science lead her to Harvard University where she is studying the history and philosophy of science—much like I did years ago. She plans to apply to medical school and various international fellowships toward her eventual goal of a research and clinical career in pediatrics.

With scholars like Vi Nguyen as the future of our biomedical research community, I am confident that the children of tomorrow will have a much better chance at healthier lives.

SPOUSAL TRAVEL DEDUCTION

HON. NEIL ABERCROMBIE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1998

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today which will help America's working individuals and families, particularly those associated with the travel and tourism industry.

My bill would re-instate the federal income tax deduction for expenses of persons traveling with spouses on business purposes. As you may know, the spousal travel deduction was a long established part of the tax code until 1993. At that time, President Clinton, as a part of his first budget to Congress proposed repeal of the deduction, along with many other tax changes. I supported his budget, despite reservations about some of the tax proposals, such as cutting the business meal and entertainment expense deduction from 80 per cent to 50 per cent, because they would have detrimental impact on the travel and tourism industry. Nonetheless, the need to reorder the nation's priorities was essential and overwhelming, and I voted in favor of the legislation.

Supporting the 1993 budget was a difficult decision, but it was the correct one. It set the basis for rapid decline in the budget deficits which have plagued the nation for decades. We now have a budget surplus projected to be in excess of \$50.0 billion. The travel industry and those states and localities dependent on the industry have sacrificed substantially in order to get our financial house in order.

There is growing support for Congress enacting tax cut and reform legislation before we adjourn in October. I have worked closely in a bipartisan manner with the Congressional leadership, members of the Ways and Means Committee and with the Administration to generate support reinstating the deduction, and many have been encouraging on the proposal's merits and the beneficial impact that it will have on the economy.

This bill is important to the working men and women of our country. The travel and tourism industry generates millions of jobs for our economy, and importantly, many of those jobs are entry level and give a first employment chance to less skilled workers, immigrants and those entering the job market for the first time. It provides an entry into the job market and opportunities for skill development, training and advancement. Representing a state and city very heavily dependent on travel and tourism, I have seen first-hand individual get a first break in the hotel and restaurant industries and advance in responsibility into management and supervisory positions. This is repeated throughout the country, but it is particularly apparent in areas with significant