

lost their jobs, and another 600,000 retirees and their surviving spouses are in danger of losing their health care benefits because the companies that once employed them are now facing bankruptcy.

A number of those families are in Washington today. In talking with them, one quickly realizes the numbers do not even begin to capture the pain they are feeling and the insecurity they face about their very future.

These families are hurting because this important sector of our economy is competing against global competitors who unfairly benefit from government subsidies or have resorted to flooding our Nation with imports.

Seven months ago, the President initiated what is called a section 201 investigation. This investigation, conducted by the International Trade Commission, found unanimously that imports have caused serious injury. That means under our trade laws the steel industry deserves an immediate and effective remedy.

In less than a week, by March 6, the President has to make his final ruling on what that remedy will be. But we already know the right remedy. The remedy is a 40-percent tariff rate for 4 years. That would be an effective enforcement of our trade laws and the right thing to do for hard-hit steel-worker families.

There is one other action the President must take, and that is lead on the issue of promoting consolidation and the protection of retirement health benefits, the benefits that were promised years ago to workers by companies that are now teetering on the verge of bankruptcy.

These benefits are so-called legacy costs. They really are a lifeline for 600,000 retirees and their surviving spouses and a measure of our commitment to the healthy and decent retirement these workers have earned.

America's steelworkers have literally built this Nation, from skyscrapers that define us, to the military that defends us. In the process, they have proven they can compete against any workers anywhere in the world and win, so long as the rules are fair.

In a very real sense, the future of the steel industry in America hinges on the administration's decision. So today we are asking the administration to use this historic opportunity to do the right thing for America's steelworkers, their industry, and the retirement health benefits on which they depend.

I yield the floor, and I thank my colleagues for their willingness to accommodate me.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri.

ELECTION REFORM

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I just happened to catch the last of the remarks of my very good friend, the distinguished majority whip, about what has happened with this election reform bill.

We ought to get the record straight. My good friend mentioned the fact that we seem to be holding this up over one little amendment. I will tell you what this is all about, Mr. President. We worked long and hard to come to a reasonable, responsible compromise because the Senator from Connecticut very eloquently made the case that we need to make it easier to vote, and I agree with that.

We worked on his portion of the bill. He made some compromises that took care of some of our concerns, but at the same time I tried to testify before the Rules Committee, and I came to the floor and made the case that there is another problem that is as serious a problem as making it difficult for somebody to vote, and that is diluting their vote with fraudulent, improper votes.

I have laid out for this body a number of times the fact that vote fraud continues to exist in Missouri and too many other States. So I proposed some solutions to give us some minimal protection against vote fraud in the future.

As part of the compromise, it was pointed out by my colleagues on the other side that requiring the photo ID may be too difficult, or requiring them to vote in person may be too difficult, although seven States do it, and I think that makes a lot of sense. St. Louis, MO, after we called attention to the vote fraud committed in November of 2000, decided to require photo IDs at the poll in the mayoral primary. Do you know something. It worked. We did not hear any complaints that people could not vote. They had an honest election in St. Louis.

I was willing to compromise with my colleagues, the Senator from Connecticut, the Senator from New York, and the Senator from New Jersey, and say if it is too burdensome to require a photo ID, let us go down the list and see what other things could be done. That is why we added that a bank statement with one's name and address can be used, or a utility bill, a government check, a paycheck, to try to make it possible so that one time in the process they would have to have proof that they were a real live human being.

Now our friends on the other side made fun of the fact that we had dogs registered to vote in Missouri and in Maryland. Well, that sounds kind of crazy, but the system is so sloppy, the motor voter law has made it possible for people to register dogs. I will guarantee there are a lot more fraudulent votes than just the dogs.

Some have objected and said we have not shown widespread fraud in St. Louis. Oh, yes, we have. Wherever we have looked, we have found fraud. Wherever we have looked, we have found ineligible people voting, dead people voting, felons voting—in Virginia, Wisconsin, California, Colorado, North Carolina, Indiana, Florida, and Texas.

What we found that in Missouri they had judges ordering people to be registered to vote. They went before a judge, and he said: Why are you not registered? One said: I am a Democrat. Another one said: I want to vote for Gore. Another one said: I have been a felon and forgot to reregister. Thirteen hundred people were registered by judge order. The secretary of state went back and did an exhaustive search on those 1,300 and found 97 percent of them were not lawful votes.

In the mayoral primary in 2001, 3,000 postcard registrations were dumped on the election board on the last day. At that point, my colleagues in the other party in St. Louis, who were a lot more concerned about stealing a mayor's race than they were about stealing a Governor's race or President's race or a Senate race, raised cane.

When those postcard registrations were looked at, they were all found to have had the same handwriting—many of them had the same handwriting. They were on one or two blocks. Those have all been turned over to the prosecuting authorities. We have not gotten any convictions yet.

We also know that right before the general election in November of 2000, 30,000 postcard registrations were dumped on the St. Louis city election board. Nobody has gone back and reviewed them, but the guess is that at least 15,000 of them were fraudulent. Is it not a little bit beyond credibility that St. Louis, which had 200,000 registered voters, would on the last 2 days of registration register 30,000 people, equal to 15 percent?

That is one of the reasons St. Louis has almost as many registered voters as it has adults. It would be truly remarkable if each one of those registrations equaled a registration of somebody who was an adult human being entitled to vote in Missouri. I do not believe it. We have not had the resources to go back and check.

Frankly, as the Senator from Pennsylvania pointed out yesterday, it is very difficult, particularly under motor voter, to prosecute people who register illegally. Why? Because there is nobody there. You sign somebody else's name, send it in, and say I promise to, with a signature affirmation and verification. I could register all my colleagues on the other side of the aisle in a Republican area of Missouri, and we would have signatures on their mail-in ballots every time. This time they might be voting our way rather than the other way.

I believe some of the people arguing against the bill yesterday were woefully uninformed about what this bill requires. I say to my friend from Oregon, this only applies to people registering after the bill becomes law. It only applies one time, either when you register or when you vote for the first time. You have to show something that would tend to prove you are a live human being, living where you said you were, entitled to vote.

Concern was expressed over provisional voting, and the registration—the identification goes into effect immediately. Right now, 39 States have either provisional voting or same-day registration. I did not draft that part of the bill that says provisional voting would only go into effect in 2004. We would be happy to move it up for the other 11 States so it takes effect immediately.

The Senator from Oregon made a very good point in his discussions yesterday: When a person registers, we ought to make sure when they register that they are legitimate voters. I agree 100 percent.

Do you know what. Motor voter prevents verification of the registration, as it now stands. That is why we had to amend it.

There was a lot of discussion yesterday about how many people we would disenfranchise, and they postulated hundreds of thousands, maybe millions, of people would be disenfranchised because they would not have a photo ID, a utility bill, a bank statement, a government check, that shows their address. I think that is hogwash.

There may be a handful of people who do not have that, but we have money in the bill for the States to go out and affirmatively identify and provide registration for people who fall through the cracks. I am happy to put a provision in there saying the States—if on application by somebody who is entitled to vote, who does not have any of these documents, they can get a State or an election board identification card. Put the burden on the States when somebody shows they have none of these articles or identifiers. I think that might be one-hundredth of a percent at the maximum.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DODD. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Missouri be allowed to speak for an additional 10 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the time for morning business be extended until the hour of 11:45 a.m.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Missouri be allowed to proceed for another 10 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator be allowed to speak under the period for morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed after Senator BOND.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed after the Senator from Oregon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Missouri is recognized for an additional 10 minutes.

ELECTION REFORM

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I do not need an additional 10 minutes. I have said all the things I need to say.

It is not just my view that signature affirmation or verification does not work. Professor Melody Rose of Portland State University in Oregon has pointed out the significant numbers, 60,000 to 80,000, perhaps, who signed someone else's ballot or had someone else mark it for them. There were problems in Oregon.

The Carter-Ford commission said signature verification and affirmation is not adequate, it is inaccurate. Check page 31 of the report. Why? You sign a mail-in registration which cannot be checked under motor voter; you put a signature on it—it could be a dog, a dead alderman, a neighbor, a fictitious brother—and every time you vote as that person, your signature will match the signature that you put on fraudulently when you registered that person.

I knew when we took on fraud, fraud would fight back. I want to make sure everybody understands that the deal we worked out was widely praised. The Senator from New York said we ought to come together because we have a good bill. I agree. I thought we had a good bill. We made a lot of compromises. There is money there to improve the voting system and get statewide registration to make it easier for those with disabilities to vote, to cut down on fraud, to have provisional voting. That is a reasonable, rational system.

I believe this body cannot go down the road saying we are making it easier to vote and harder to cheat. They blow a huge hole in the voter fraud section by saying all you have to do is sign your name or sign a dog's name or sign a dead person's name or sign a fictitious brother or sister's name. That is what this is all about.

I am not the one trying to torpedo this bill. We had a torpedo in midship, yesterday, from people who had been part of the compromise on grounds I do not think were legitimate. I think there was some misunderstanding by many. We talked to staff people who did not realize the aspects I just pointed out, the fact that it is a one-time registration, only for people who register after this goes into effect. They said, maybe people will be disenfranchised. We will do everything in our power to make sure that does not happen.

Fraud has been proven. Fraud is alive and well in Missouri. There is a whole list of other places where fraud exists.

Mr. SCHUMER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BOND. I am happy to yield the floor, and I am happy to respond to any of my colleagues.

Mr. SCHUMER. I have been listening to the Senator as we had a debate on the amendment. The Senator from Oregon and I have added to his proposal. I have been very mindful of the passion of the Senator from Missouri about fraud. I respect it, appreciate it, and do not belittle it in any way. He has been through it.

If the Senator says there has been a large amount of fraud in Missouri, I am not here to quarrel with that. He knows his State better than I do. All I ask is to understand where this Senator is coming from. The Senator from Oregon and I are coming from slightly different places because our systems are different. In New York—and I checked again yesterday; we called around the State, people not just of one party or another—there has been almost no allegation of any kind of fraud with our system, which is a signature system.

Yet I do know one thing. If we were to adopt the section he proposed, it would make it more difficult for many of our citizens to vote. We have 8 million people in New York. About 6 million, a little over than that, are above voting age. Only 3 million have driver's licenses. Half the people in New York City don't have driver's licenses. A good number of those—there are no statistics, as there are no statistics, really, on fraud in our State; it is what you hear and know of your State—a good number of those do not have a utility bill to exhibit.

Having spent a lot of time at polling places, which I do in New York, as does the Senator in Missouri, I know how worried and scared lots of our voters are—new voters, people who voted for the first time, even if they are 30 or 40 years old.

I say to the Senator, I respect his passion to try to deal with fraud. Fraud is terrible for the system. As the Senator knows, except for this provision, I have been fully supportive in our meetings of all the other items—the registration lists and everything else—that the Senator has added to the bill. I believe he has made it a better bill.

My question to the Senator: Is there a way we can deal with the problems in Missouri and still deal with the problems in New York and move this bill forward? That is what I would like to do. I know the Senator from Connecticut has some ideas and others have some ideas. I ask the Senator if he has any thoughts about that. Perhaps we are not—I pray, we are not—on an irreconcilable course.

I yield.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I am very pleased to hear that fraud does not exist in New York. That is reassuring.

I pointed out yesterday that 14,000 New York City residents were also registered to vote in south Florida. Would