

bogus registrations for people already registered.

The U.S. attorney has now taken over the case, and a Federal grand jury investigation is underway, as the FBI has recently issued a subpoena to the St. Louis Election Board for records pertaining to any person who registered to vote between October 1 of last year and March 6 of this year. They also requested all records of anyone who cast absentee ballots or regular ballots, as well as anyone who was turned away from voting.

It is obvious that there has been brazen fraud with these bogus voter registrations. With dead people registering, fake names on voter lists, and phony addresses, it is painfully clear that the system is being abused.

The only conclusion: Reform is imperative.

There are three key weaknesses in the current system: the ease in which drop sites can be created; the ability of individuals to imposter others and vote in their name; and dual registrations.

The drop sites are a direct result of allowing mail-in or drop-off registration without also requiring some form of authentication that the names being registered are of people actually existing. This creates pools of false names on the voter rolls.

Because absentee voting after mail-in registration is allowed, it is very easy for those bent on cheating to cast votes for people who never existed. This clearly is in need of reform.

Second, the ability of individuals to pose as others is directly dependent upon what type of identification is required for people voting. In the St. Louis mayoral primary this past March, as a result of the attention I and others brought to this situation, they required photo IDs, and there were no complaints of voter impersonation or voter intimidation. Obviously, the ability to pose as another would be severely restricted with a simple photo ID requirement. St. Louis may have had an honest election. It should be celebrated in the history of Missouri. The March election was an honest one.

Third, the number of dual registrations creates a huge pool of names for the unscrupulous to abuse. It also causes confusion for the legitimate voters. A statewide database would clearly eliminate most dual registrations. That is certainly one of the recommendations of the Carter-Ford Commission that deserves support.

However, as simple as these reforms may be, the problems are deeper. For example, motor voter actually blocks States from requiring notarization or other forms of authentication on mail-in registration cards.

Given that nearly all of the fraudulent registrations were mail-in forms, it is obvious that we need to make real reforms in this area. At a minimum, States need to be given the authority to require on mail registration forms a place for notarization or other authentication. Under current law, States are

actually prohibited from including this safeguard. This is one obvious place where the Federal law is clearly an impediment to antifraud efforts. Why do we so easily require a photo ID to board a plane or to buy beer and cigarettes, while leaving the ballot box undefended?

Motor voter has also built a system whereby once bogus names are registered, it is impossible to get them off the lists. Current Federal law blocks a person's removal from the rolls unless he or she is reported dead, requests removal, or the U.S. Postal Service returns certified election board mailings to the person as "undeliverable" and the person fails to vote in two successive Federal elections. When names are added to vote lists for fraudulent purposes, they certainly are not going to request removal, or they certainly are not going to forget to vote. If you have gone to the trouble to register somebody fraudulently, you are going to vote them in every election. What protections do we have? None.

We passed the motor voter bill with best intentions. Unfortunately, we now have proof that the very mechanism designed to boost voter participation has turned the Nation's voter rolls into a tangled mess. In Missouri, we saw how the motor voter flaws paralyzed the St. Louis Election Board last year. The board's inability to maintain its lists invited brazen vote fraud, now the subject of a Federal criminal probe.

In Florida, St. Louis, and elsewhere, sloppy maintenance of voter rolls fueled charges of minority disenfranchisement. The legacy of the motor voter bill is that while it tried to boost voter participation, it may, in fact, now be responsible for reducing the integrity of and confidence in our elections. The best election "reform" Congress can undertake this year is to go back and fix the flaws in the law we passed 7 years ago.

We need to get a handle on the voter lists. People who register and follow the rules should not be frustrated by inadequate polling places and phone lines, or confused by out-of-date lists. At the same time, we must require the voter list to be scrubbed and reviewed in a much more timely manner—so cheaters cannot use confusion as their friend.

It is time we got rid of St. Louis's lasting reputation, described my old friend Quincy Troop this way: The only way you can win a close election in this town, you have to beat the cheat.

Madam President, I thank the Chair and my colleagues. I yield the floor.

RELEASING THE HOLD ON TWO NOMINEES FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I had written placing a hold on two nominees from the Department of Health and Human Services. I wrote that last week on Janet Rehnquist, on

July 27. She is up for inspector general of the Department of Health and Human Services; and Alex Michael Azar, II, up for general counsel of the Department of Health and Human Services.

I placed a hold on them and had notified them on that day, last Friday. I had a meeting with them on Monday and I have written today releasing the hold.

The hold was placed on them on a matter that is ongoing. That is because, when we had the Budget Appropriation hearings on the National Institutes of Health, Senator HARKIN and I had written—I was chairman at the time—to the Institutes asking questions about stem cell research. The replies we got were censored, and we finally laboriously got the originals and found that information very favorable to stem cell research had been deleted. I asked Secretary Thompson about that and got an unsatisfactory answer, which I need not go into in any detail about here. And then NIH had submitted a 200-page report to the Department of Health and Human Services, and that report on the report was published in the New York Times in mid-June.

Senator HARKIN and I could not get it until less than 24 hours after we had a hearing on stem cells on that report 2 weeks ago. I talked to the inspector general nominee, Janet Rehnquist, about assurances that if she were confirmed that she would, as inspector general of HHS, conduct a thorough inquiry into why those reports were censored.

I received a letter in reply, and I need not go into detail now, and it is really not determinative for consideration because I am advised by the chairman of the Finance Committee they will not be reported out before recess with respect to Mr. Azar. I asked him about his standards as general counsel to render an opinion on stem cell research, which would be an objective opinion. The general counsel, under the previous administration, had rendered an opinion that the Federal statute barred extracting stem cells from the embryos, but did not ban research once they had been extracted.

The President has taken a contrary position, and funding has been held up. I wanted assurances from Mr. Azar that his determination would be an objective determination. He has written to me. It is not ripe for a final determination, but I wanted to comment because of the importance of the subject and state publicly that the holds have been withdrawn as far as this Senator is concerned.

I thank the Chair especially for her diligence in presiding.

I yield the floor.

LOUIS ARMSTRONG DAY

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I wish to thank my colleagues, Senators SCHUMER, BREAUX, LANDRIEU, and

LIEBERMAN for co-sponsoring my resolution designating this Saturday, the centennial of a great American legend's birthday, "Louis Armstrong Day."

Thanks to the wonders of technology, we can all continue to appreciate the genius of Louis Armstrong's music. It is music that uplifts the spirit, and that has inspired countless musicians and fans for nearly a century. There are millions of people around the world who love Louis Armstrong's music. And, thanks to the wonders of technology, there are millions more who have never heard his music who someday will, and their lives will be uplifted. From the perspective of this Louis Armstrong fan, they've all got something to look forward to.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE COUNTERDRUG SUPPORT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I rise to express my deep concern about the apparent lack of emphasis by the Department of Defense on the counterdrug mission. This has been a year of continual discussion of increased DoD funding for various military missions. However, all the indications I am hearing point to a decreased DoD interest in this mission, as well as decreased funding levels. I believe this would be a poor policy decision, and a poor indication of the nation's priorities.

In May 2001 testimony, before the Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control, on which I served as Chairman, the heads of the Drug Enforcement Administration, the U.S. Customs Service, and the U.S. Coast Guard all testified that DoD reductions would be detrimental to their agencies' counterdrug efforts. The Office of National Drug Control Policy summarized that (quote) DoD's command and control system provides the communications connectivity and information system backbone . . . while the military services detection and monitoring assets provide a much need intelligence cueing capability (end quote).

The Commandant of the Coast Guard testified at length about DoD counterdrug support, stating (quote) [w]e would go downhill very quickly (end quote) without DoD contributions. The Commandant also stated that 43 percent of Coast Guard seizures last year were from U.S. Navy vessels, using onboard Coast Guard law enforcement detachments. The Coast Guard concluded that (quote) [s]hould there be any radical reduction of the assets provided through the Department of Defense . . . it would peril the potential for all the other agencies to make their contributions as productive . . . mainly because of the synergy that is generated by the enormous capability that the 800-pound gorilla brings to the table . . . They are very, very good at what they do. They are the best in the world . . . and when they share those capabilities . . . in

terms of intelligence fusion and command and control, we do much better than we would ever otherwise have a chance to do (end quote). I understand that an internal review of DoD's drug role contemplated severe reductions as a working assumption. After years of decline in DoD's role in this area, I believe this sends the wrong signal and flies in the face of DoD's statutory authority.

I have consistently supported an integrated national counterdrug strategy. If we reduce the DoD role, we risk lessening the effectiveness of other agencies as well. We need to make these decisions carefully, and with full Congressional involvement. I urge the Department of Defense to keep in mind DoD's important role in, and necessary contribution to, a serious national drug control strategy.

AMERICAN INDIAN ENERGY AND NATIONAL ENERGY SECURITY

Mr. CAMPBELL. Madam President, as Congress begins the August recess and Americans get in their cars, vans and trucks to take their deserved vacations, we should keep in mind that the U.S. dependency on foreign sources of energy is at an all-time high of more than 60 percent.

Both the House and Senate are considering various parts of what will become our national energy plan, but to date little attention has been paid to energy development and conservation on American Indian reservations.

Indian lands comprise about 5 percent of the total landmass of our Nation and if consolidated, would be about the size of the State of Minnesota. In the last century, Indians were relegated to small remnants of their aboriginal lands, in areas most considered ill suited to agriculture or any other form of activity.

On and under these Indian-owned lands are huge reserves of oil, natural gas, coal bed methane, uranium, and alternative sources of energy such as wind and hydropower. There are many tribes that want to develop these energy resources and are looking to Congress for assistance to do just that.

We are not just talking about drilling in the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge, ANWR. Indian resources span from the coal fields of Montana to the natural gas patch in Colorado and beyond.

The tribes are not only interested in research and development, and financial and tax incentives, though they are needed, but are looking for changes and reforms to existing regulations that have kept energy and other projects from Indian lands.

Developing Indian energy is not only in the interest of the tribes and their members, but is largely consistent with the Bush administration's emphasis on production, conservation, and ensuring long-term supply is guaranteed.

It is Congress' obligation to ensure the Nation's supply of energy is secure

and also to assist Indian tribal development and job creation in the process. To this end I am working to help ensure that tribes are brought into the fold when Congress gets serious about energy policy this fall.

I ask unanimous consent that copies of various recent news articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 29, 2001]

FALLING ENERGY PRICES COULD SPARK THE ECONOMY

(By Greg Ip)

WASHINGTON.—Energy prices, which helped drive the economy to the brink of recession, are declining and could be crucial to reviving growth.

Rising production, moderate weather and weakening demand have helped reduce prices of natural gas, gasoline and Western wholesale electricity to below year-ago levels and return inventories to a comfortable range. If sustained, the drop in prices, combined with a tax cut and lower interest rates, helps increase the likelihood of an economic recovery in coming months.

But here is the catch: Prices have dropped in part because slowing economies in the U.S. and abroad have lessened demand. A sharp rebound in growth could tighten supplies and cause prices to rise.

"It looks that the worse of the energy stocks may be behind us, in part because of growing supply and, even more important, the effects of the economic downturn are really starting to show up on the demand side," said Tom Robinson, senior director at Cambridge Energy Research Associates. "The market looks much better supplied heading into the summer and next winter than most people would have thought six months ago."

Higher energy prices, by some estimates, reduced economic growth about a percentage point in the past year by sapping consumer incomes. Spending isn't likely to fully rebound because the prices haven't returned to previous levels and because retail electric bills have yet to fully reflect the jump in wholesale costs earlier this year.

Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan yesterday blamed rising energy costs for hurting profit margins and investment as they drove up business costs between the spring of 2000 and last winter, little of which was passed on in higher prices.

The subsequent decline suggests "some easing in pressures on profit margins from energy this quarter," he told the Economic Club of Chicago. While the Fed couldn't be certain the spike in gasoline prices "is behind us . . . it is encouraging that in market economies well-publicized forecasts of crises, such as earlier concerns about gasoline price surges this summer, more often than not fail to develop."

Crude-oil prices have slipped to about \$25 a barrel from an average of \$28.63 in May and more than \$30 a year ago. But drops in other energy prices have been more striking. Consider:

Spot natural-gas prices, which rose from \$4.40 per million British thermal units a year ago to above \$10 in the winter, have since slipped to about \$3.25. Mr. Robinson estimates robust drilling activity has lifted North American production as much as 3% from a year ago, while demand has fallen as some power plants substituted cheaper fuels for gas. Combined that has dramatically boosted gas in storage from far below seasonal norms to well above.