

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

the Senator care to make a friendly wager that none of them voted twice?

Mr. SCHUMER. In answer to my friend's question, I would ask the Senator to give me a single instance of people who voted twice. Here is why: The way our voting rolls work, it would be cleared up by the bill. You must remain on the voting rolls for a minimum, I believe, of 8 years once you stop voting. So every day probably 1,000 people from New York move to south Florida.

My guess is there are more than 14,000 people on the voting rolls in New York and south Florida because you are not stricken from the rolls in New York even if you have not voted for 6 years. That is not an indication of any fraud whatever. If the Senator from Missouri could come forward and show me even 10 cases where this happened—maybe it has, but we don't have evidence of it, and we certainly don't have evidence that anyone is organized to do it. It is just the way our system works.

I am sure there is occasional fraud in New York. I said to the Senator there is no instance of widespread or organized fraud, of large numbers of people who come in and vote fraudulently, organized by someone or not.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I make a friendly wager that maybe quite a few of those people voted twice.

I think the Senator from New York has raised a point we did not adequately address. It was a point raised by the Senator from Montana who said there has to be a more effective way of getting those voters no longer living in the State off the rolls. That causes confusion.

In Montana they have many people who come in and register while they are at college, then move away. If we are going to go back and compromise again, I told some people yesterday this compromise on election reform is like loading frogs in a wheelbarrow: I keep thinking I have a half wheelbarrow full, and I come back with the frogs and the wheelbarrow is empty.

We need to be able to clean up those rolls. Eight years means there is a lot of confusion and a lot of opportunity. We will be happy to work on that.

The second point the Senator from New York has pointed out is there may well be voters in New York who do not have a driver's license. Granted. When I lived in New York, I was scared to death to drive. I was scared to death of taxicabs, but I sure wouldn't take a bike. I did not keep a car in New York City when I lived there.

They may not have a paycheck. Some of them don't even get a government check of any kind.

Mr. SCHUMER. Right.

Mr. BOND. Some of them don't even have a bank account. I think that is a rather small universe. But I am willing to make explicit what I believe is already in the law—staff on the majority side has assured us it is already in the law—that money can be used. But I will be happy to make it explicit. If

you have Joe or Jane Doe, who do not have any of those things, we should be providing the money to the registration authority to give them a card or to ascertain their registration and get them registered. If they don't have any of those items, they ought to have a chance to be registered. We ought to identify them.

The Carter-Ford commission says one should have an identifying number. That would help us a lot. Carter-Ford pointed out that, No. 1, signature verification doesn't work—and I can assure you, it doesn't work from our side, from what we have seen in Missouri.

Those are the outlines that I think would work.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The additional time allotted to the Senator from Missouri has expired. The Senator from Oregon is recognized under the previous order.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I see the Senator from Missouri is in the Chamber. I want to make a comment to address some of the concerns the Senator has voiced.

In particular, with respect to the process that has been followed, I was not involved in any of the negotiations with the Senator from Missouri. I made it very clear I am interested in meeting him halfway in trying to find some common ground. We have been talking since the vote yesterday—Senator DODD, Senator MCCONNELL, Senator SCHUMER, Senator BOND, myself—really, hour after hour since yesterday. I do believe at this point there is a framework for a genuine compromise that could allow this bill to go forward. I want to outline what I think that framework is because we all ought to try to come together and get a bill.

I was asked yesterday by the press and others: Maybe those on the other side just don't want a bill? I stuck up for the Senator from Missouri. I said I believe he wants a bill. I think he wants us to come together. We have some differences of opinion.

Here is the framework for what in my view is a genuine compromise. What we ought to try to do is tighten up at the front end of the process. Let's tighten up with respect to registration. That is the best way to deter fraud. Right now, the tough antifraud provisions with respect to registration don't kick in until a ways down the road. Let's figure out a way to make them kick in earlier. Let's tighten up at the front end so we all come together and make it clear we are interested in deterring fraud, we are not interested in deterring voting.

But at the same time, what we would ask in return for our effort to meet the concerns of our colleague from Missouri with respect to the registration process and tough antifraud processes—at the front end we ask to let the signature be valid when people vote because on our side, and in the State of Oregon, we believe very strongly in the 27 States where that is used, it works.

We know our colleague does not share that view. Sincere people agree with him. But I would say when he cites studies in Oregon, which I have not seen, the colleague that sits just a few seats from him, Senator SMITH, made it clear—after a very difficult and contested election where he clearly could have said: I have some questions about how these votes were cast—Senator SMITH, to his credit, said the system worked and there were not the problems the Senator from Missouri has found.

So as of right now, without the legislation that has been drafted by the Senator from New York and me, it seems what we are doing is discouraging people from voting now but not putting in place the toughest antifraud provisions until 2004. We ought to keep negotiating. We ought to continue the work.

By the way, even when we were debating the Schumer and Wyden amendment, I suggested to my colleagues, and was very appreciative of what the chairman of the committee said—I went to him and said: We have the votes. We have the votes now. We have done our checking. We have the votes. But let's still reach out even before the vote and try to have a compromise.

That was echoed by the distinguished chairman of the committee, Senator DODD, who said even the night before the vote: Let's stay at it.

I didn't have a chance to be part of the negotiations and the process. I know there are some who have concerns about that process. But I said from the very beginning, because I was not part of that process, I would have to take steps—I was inclined to put a public hold on the bill to make sure my State wasn't rolled.

At every stage of the process that I had a chance to be part of, and this has been backed up by Senator DODD and Senator SCHUMER and the leadership, we have been trying to find a way to meet in a genuine compromise. I think the framework for that genuine compromise is to tighten up on the front end, come down as aggressively as we possibly can on fraud where we can best deter it, which is at the beginning of the process, through registration, but then let those signatures be valid for a ballot, a system that we believe works in 27 States, and not create new obstacles.

Mr. BOND. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WYDEN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. BOND. First, the Senator is aware that we did take care of one of the Oregon problems. When he pointed out we could not send a second ballot, he is aware that we did agree to change the requirement in the underlying law. I understood it was at the request of the Senators from Oregon and Washington. We made the change.

Your staff asked for it and we did make the change.

Mr. WYDEN. I want to respond. The Senator clearly has been working in

good faith and we appreciate that. What I am trying to do this morning is to see if I can help get the rest of the way. I think in this arcane area of election law, where I think, frankly, the Senators from Missouri and Connecticut and New York know more about this nationally than do I, it is very complicated. But I think there is the framework for a genuine compromise. If we stick with that kind of outline, I think we can still get there and we ought to try with this bill which, as a result of efforts of the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Connecticut, has a lot of good in it. It has a lot of useful provisions. I am for it, but we have to get over this particular problem.

Mr. BOND. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WYDEN. Of course.

Mr. BOND. Just a further question. I stated very clearly that I applaud and support the Senator's premise that we ought to make sure the registration the first time is legitimate because that is where the problem begins. I will ask the Senator a two-part question: Does he understand that existing motor voter law does not permit effective ascertainment of the legitimacy of a registration upon registration, No. 1? And, No. 2, that the bill before us would not apply to anybody who is already registered?

We had set up these requirements. Is the Senator aware we set up these requirements only for people registering after the date of the act, and they only have to meet the requirements to prove they are a live, qualified human being, one time—either upon registration or upon the first vote? Is the Senator aware of those two things?

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, the Senator makes a valid point with respect to the first part. With respect to the second part, I and others think the motor voter law has been an important step forward. We are concerned about the implication that some of the spirit and substance of it could be unraveled. That is why we are trying to stay at the table with the distinguished Senator from Missouri and work this out.

I think if we can get an acceptance of the proposition that a signature should be valid to the ballot—if that basic proposition can be accepted, which is something we believe works in 27 States—I think we can do a great deal to reach out on the other concerns the Senator from Missouri has. He has raised them consistently. He understands the substance of this very well. We are trying to reach out to him in an effort to get this compromise.

But what we need in return is to know that when people actually vote after they have gone through what I would call a real gauntlet of steps to make sure there are antifraud provisions at the front end, then let us have a signature be valid for the ballot, a system which works very well in our State.

I will close by way of saying I think people are stunned by this. In the Sen-

ate special election in 1996, we tripled the rate of voter participation from the previous Senate special elections in this country. This is a system that has empowered voters.

That is why it is so important in those 27 States to seniors, the disabled, minorities, and others. With record turnouts, people are being prosecuted now in a small number of instances. Where there is fraud, we would like to find a way to protect against that as it relates to having a signature be valid to the ballot.

In return, we are willing to meet the Senator from Missouri halfway and more on the front end so that we come down aggressively on fraud in the area where we believe it can do the most.

My time has expired. I am inclined to get back to the negotiating table with the Senators from Missouri, Connecticut, and New York so we can get a bipartisan compromise.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, my chief of staff and my counsel negotiated 4 to 5 hours a day for 6 months, and they thought they had reached the end. If the Senator from Oregon and I are now talking about different things than what he has outlined, it would seem to make very good sense. No. 1, he says make sure there is a real, live person qualified to vote when they register. Hallelujah. If we can do that, then I agree that they sign a registration, and any time they go to vote, all they have to do is sign, whether it is a mail-in or whether it is voting in person.

But what I want to make sure of is when that first registration comes in, there is something to identify it. It is not a gauntlet. It is picking one of the pieces of evidence that shows they are a real, live human being, or, if we can find a better way, that we can even task the local election authorities to use money we provide them to verify.

If they confirm that the registrations are legitimate, and if they deal with the problem that the Senator from New York and the Senator from Connecticut laid out about the 8 years full of clogged rolls, there is no problem that I have with letting people vote by signature once it is proven they are real, live human beings at the beginning of the registration process. If that is the basis, we can start over again, and see all of you in July, maybe.

But the Senator from Connecticut is good humored, equally determined, and is willing to go at it again.

If what the Senator from Oregon laid out is what I said, then I think there is some good possibility that we can get agreement. But sending in a signature alone is not going to cut the mustard.

We will get back to the Senator from New York on the number of people doubledipping. The December 19th issue of the New York Post reports on doubledippers. We will get back with the information on that. That is a good reason to clean up the registration rolls. I hope we can do that as well.

I thank the Chair. I thank particularly my colleague from Connecticut for his good humor throughout this.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARPER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to speak in morning business for about 9 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

(The remarks of Mr. GRASSLEY pertaining to the introduction of S. 1974 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended until the hour of 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. WELLSTONE pertaining to the submission of S.R. 213 are printed in Today's RECORD under "Statements on Submitted Resolutions.")

THE STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I thank the steelworkers of America for coming to Washington, DC, today. I think it is a historic gathering. Time is not neutral or on the side of these workers and their families, including the taconite workers in the Iron Range in Minnesota. I could spend hours on our trade policy and the ways in which I do not think we have a fair trade policy. But when you have the best workers who care fiercely about their families and their communities in our country and essentially the dumping of steel and, for that matter, semifinished steel in our market, way below the cost of production in other countries, much less quite often produced at wages that are deplorable wages, the effect is devastating.

The request and the demand of the White House, which follows up on an International Trade Commission recommendation, is for a 40-percent import fee. If we get that fee, then we will be able to compete effectively. If we don't get that fee, I think it will be very difficult to see a future for the steel industry in our country. There will be no way we can cover legacy costs, health care costs of retirees; and a whole lot of very decent, good, working people are going to be spat out of this economy.

Nobody is asking for a leg up on anybody else. Frankly, when you see the