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 if 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