Dakota, 1Minnesota, 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.

For those who wish democracy in Cuba, I can only say I hope so too. However, it is wishful thinking if you think it is going to come about as long as Fidel Castro is in power. The only way to see democracy in Cuba and to see our hemisphere democratic and to have normal relations again with that small Nation state to the south is for Fidel Castro to leave office and for those who supported him for all these years to end that support.

Castro may make modest changes in how he does business, which have no bearing in reality upon ever becoming truly democratic or allowing a true market system to work, and he is given a reward to do this by the continued open door policies of these allies who pour these dollars in through the businesses that operate there.

In Title III of the law that is known as Helms-Burton that was passed in 1996, there was a provision very important to stopping this continued support of the Castro regime. That provision allows U.S. nationals to sue in U.S. Federal court those persons that traffic in property confiscated in Cuba. Unfortunately, the President is allowed to grant waivers of up to six months for implementation of this provision. Since Helms-Burton was enacted, President Clinton has routinely waived this section.

There can be no lawsuits, no litigation in American courts against foreign corporations, foreign business interests that invest in previously owned American property in Cuba or American interests in Cuba. That is a horrible decision by the President. It is outrageous what he did. It is something that kowtows to the big business interests of our allies and is detrimental to everything that we believe in and to the best interests of our national security and our interests in this hemisphere.

Our interest is in having democracy in Cuba and that can only happen when the noose is tied tightly enough around Castro and the current Cuban regime that he is ousted and that a new government comes into place. The economy of that country is dependent upon these investments and anything we can do to stop the money from flowing and the support from flowing into this government and into its economy is essential and important and critical, not only to the freedom-loving people who want to be free in Cuba, Cuban Americans and Cubans everywhere, but also to America, the United States' national security interest.

There is no real progress being made. Castro's playing us for a sucker and this administration is blind to that fact. You cannot have your cake and eat it, too, Mr. President. You must understand that if we are to end this tyrannical dictatorship south of the United States, only 90 miles off our coast, a true embargo has to be enforced, a true economic embargo. And this provision, Title III of the Helms-Burton law allowing Americans to sue in court companies abroad that are doing business and investing in American interests, formerly American interests in Cuba, has to be allowed to go forward. And if it does, then and only then do we have a chance of ousting Castro in some more peaceable manner other than short of some invading force, which none of us is predicting or expecting or advocating.

I hope and pray that my colleagues will join with me in the next few months as we go back and revisit this issue legislatively. If the President is not willing to enforce title III of Helms-Burton and is going to continue to waive it, then I would suggest it is within our power and this Congress should pass a law that says that title III is no longer eligible for waiver, that it indeed is the law of this land, that Americans who formerly had an interest in Cuba can sue foreign companies investing in those property interests in Cuba.

I would urge my colleagues to examine it. It is a very important ingredient in our foreign policy. We should never have allowed a dictatorship to exist for 40 years of such a vile nature as we have in Castro south of here, just 90 miles off our coast. And there is no reason, no reason to allow our allies and their business interests to continue to prop up that dictatorship with its human rights violations any longer. The time has long since passed to do something about it. Let us act in this Congress to force the hand of this President and to allow American citizens to sue, at the very least to try to bring some pressure that can be legitimately brought on the Cuban regime in addition to enforcing the embargo and whatever else we can do within our powers.

NAMING THE THOMAS S. FOLEY FEDERAL BUILDING AND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE AND THE WALTER F. HORAN PLAZA

HON. GEORGE R. NETHERCUTT, JR.

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation, designating the federal building located at West 920 Riverside Avenue, Spokane, Washington, as the ''Thomas S. Foley Federal Building and United States Courthouse.'' The bill also designates the plaza located immediately in front of the building as the ''Walter F. Horan Plaza.'' Rep. Foley had offices in this building and Rep. Horan was instrumental in securing funding for its construction.

Many Members will recall the long and distinguished career of Rep. Tom Foley, who now serves as our nation's Ambassador to Japan. Mr. Foley was a Member of this body for 30 years, concluding his service as Speaker of the House in the 103rd Congress. He also served as Speaker in the 102nd Congress, and in prior years held positions as Majority Leader, Majority Whip, and as Chairman of the House Agriculture Committee.

Mr. Foley personified the high ideals to which all of us aspire as Members of Congress. First and foremost he was a gentleman who sought consensus among all Members. He loved Congress, believing it to be the best forum for democracy in the world.

Tom Foley is a native son of Spokane, Washington, having attended local schools earned his undergraduate and law degrees from the University of Washington. His parents were dignified and highly respected citizens of Spokane. He was first elected to Congress in 1964 and served in the House for 30 years. In 1997 he was nominated by President Clinton and confirmed by the Senate to serve as Ambassador to Japan.

Tom Foley was—and continues to be—widely regarded in eastern Washington State and has left a lasting legacy.

Today we also honor another native son, Walter F. Horan. He served 22 years—spanning the years 1943 to 1965—as the Congressman from eastern Washington. He was born in a log cabin on the banks of the Wenatchee River in an area settled by his father, a fact he proudly boasted of, raised in Wenatchee, served in the Navy during the First World War, graduated from Washington State University in Pullman, and returned to Wenatchee to raise apples on his family farm.

Following election to Congress he served on several committees, but for most of his tenure he sat on the Appropriations Committee, rising to third in seniority on the Republican side. He paid particularly close attention to agriculture and conservation interests and continued to share in the operation of his family farm while serving in Congress.

Rep. Horan was a consummate advocate of western interests, especially those of eastern Washington, and he also conducted himself with dignity and honor as a Member of Congress. He died in 1966 and is buried in his beloved hometown of Wenatchee.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES GROUP LONG-TERM CARE INSURANCE ACT OF 1999

HON. ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1999

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the President of the United States, William Jefferson Clinton, I am pleased to introduce this important legislation that will provide long-term care insurance to federal employees. Long-term care refers to a broad range of health, social, and environmental support services and assistance provided by paid and unpaid caregivers in institutional, home, and community settings to persons who are limited in their ability to function independently on a daily basis. The need for long-term care insurance is evidence as the population ages and older Americans need assistance for their daily living.

The number of Americans over 65 will leap from 34 million in 1995 to 60 million by 2025. Americans will find it impossible to afford nursing home care which will increase from $40,000 today to $97,000 by 2030. Under current law, a family would have to deplete all their financial resources to qualify for medicaid which would only pay for a portion of needed long-term care services. By offering long-term care as a benefit option for its employees, the federal government, as the nation's largest employer, can set the example for other employers whose workforce will be facing the same long-term care needs.

The ''Federal Employees Group Long-Term Care Insurance Act of 1999'' would authorize the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) to purchase a policy or policies from one or more qualified private-sector contractors to make long-term care insurance available to federal employees and retirees, and family members whom OPM defines as eligible, at group rates. Coverage would be paid for entirely by those who elect it.

OPM will select a single or a very small number of carriers based on quality, service and price to offer a high-quality benefits package to eligible participants. This benefits package would be consistent with the most recent National Association of Insurance Commissioners standards. OPM will be open to various financing arrangements proposed by the