

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 tripped 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. 974 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

import surge of the last several years—so much of this well below cost of production—and you see the impact on people, you know we ought to do something.

So the President has until the beginning of next week to act. We call on him to do the right thing. We believe it is the right thing. There are going to be steelworkers from all across the country today. There are going to be marching bands from high schools from all across the country today. I have been told there may be more than 10,000 steelworkers coming to Washington, DC, for themselves, for their children, their communities, and for the country. I hope their voice is listened to.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. LANDRIEU). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak in morning business for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a 10-minute time limitation. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair and welcome the occupant, the Senator from Louisiana. I look forward to providing her with some factual information this morning, not that she has not been exposed to factual information before.

ARCTIC NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I received a letter in my office from the respected former President Jimmy Carter. I suspect this letter went to every Member. It was an appeal on the issue of the energy bill which has been laid down by the majority leader and will be taken up at some point, probably next week.

In his letter, President Carter highlights the realization that every decade or so we have a great national debate about whether or not to preserve our national heritage. He indicated that in the sixties, it was over building dams in the Grand Canyon to oil drilling in Yosemite or Yellowstone. Clearly, there is no consideration for oil drilling in either Yosemite or Yellowstone, to both of which I would object. I know virtually every Member in this body would.

President Carter indicates in his letter that the significant issue before us today is the fate of the Coastal Plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, an area first set aside for protection by President Dwight Eisenhower. He is

correct in that generalization, but what he does not add is that out of that area, so-called ANWR, there were 1.5 million acres, or the 1002 area, left out specifically at the declaration of President Eisenhower for Congress to make a determination of the disposition.

Since that time, the matter of opening ANWR has been debated before this body. Many of us will recall that in 1995, in the omnibus bill, ANWR had prevailed and President Clinton vetoed it.

It is important to recognize the sequence of events because they are not necessarily as recounted in President Carter's letter. He states that he has enjoyed the extraordinary beauty of the peninsula and Beaufort Sea, watching the musk ox circle their young. He has wandered on the tundra near the Jago River as the caribou streamed through. He has watched this timeless migration from vital calving grounds. He has watched the dens of wolves, large flocks of Dall sheep, and isolated polar bears. "These phenomena," he terms it, "of the untrammelled earth are what lead wildlife experts to characterize the coastal plain as America's Serengeti."

I live there. I have spent all my life there. I have spent a good deal of time in the Arctic. His description is not without some further explanation.

The difference with the American Serengeti is, of course, the wildlife concentration is virtually year round, and the caribou, which is a nomadic animal, moves through the area. It is quite inspiring when they move through the area, but they are not residents.

In the wintertime, which is 9½ to 10 months of the year, there is virtually no activity of any kind relative to wildlife and bird life. Nonetheless, we have an obligation to address the compatibility of the natural wildlife and the wildlife experience of visitors and the realization that we also have a tremendous amount of reserves of oil in this area. There is a compatibility.

President Carter further states:

Having traveled extensively in this unique wilderness, I feel very strongly about its incredible natural values.

I do, too.

He hopes Members "will not be distracted by the argument that oil exploration and development will have minimal impact because the 'footprint' of modern drilling technology will be small amid the 1,500,000 acres of the coastal plain."

This is where we depart because what he fails to take into consideration is the people who live there and their thoughts and aspirations. I will perhaps go into that a little later.

One realizes in his letter he assumes this area is an absolute wilderness devoid of any villages, devoid of any footprint, and devoid of any personal expression of attitude from the Eskimo people who live on the Coastal Plain, whether they live in Barrow or Kaktovik, or whether the activities in

Prudhoe Bay have, in fact, been a distraction.

He further suggests a precise measurement of activity in the 1002 area would involve a web of drilling pads, gravel pits, access roads, and air fields. While these might not exceed 2,000 acres, they would be spread across a far wider expanse covering hundreds of square miles, connected by a network of what he calls modern transportation routes.

As those who follow the debate recognize, that simply is not the case. We have developed the technology dramatically, and that technology is evidenced in the transition from Prudhoe Bay, which is the 30-year-old technology which uses large areas of surface for roads and so forth, to the development of Endicott, which came on as the 10th largest field, and the actual footprint was 56 acres.

So the point is, we have this technology. It will be advanced if indeed ANWR is opened. It would be further advanced to have ice roads as the access for development of drilling, not roads. We would not open up gravel pits; that would not be necessary because we have technology now that allows us to move only in the wintertime and not leave a footprint in the summer. Further, the directional drilling technology suggests if we were to drill on the Capitol Grounds, we could focus on an oilfield as far away as the Reagan Airport, outside the edge of Washington, DC. That is the technology we have.

So it is an entirely different set of circumstances. To suggest that somehow this would be an expanse covering hundreds of miles, with airports and so forth, is totally inaccurate.

I have a picture. This is children in Kaktovik. To indicate where Kaktovik is, this is in the 1002 area. This is a village that has been there for a long time. There are real people there. They have hopes and aspirations. We have other pictures of Kaktovik which can give an idea of the realism that President Carter simply overlooks in his letter. He suggests this is an unspoiled wilderness. Here is a village that is actually in the 1002 area. There is an old radar site. Here is the community hall.

These people happen to support opening the area. Why? They want a better opportunity. They want health care. They want toilets that flush. They want running water. They want to have opportunities for the children.

It is one thing to simply address the environmental aspects, but that is hardly fair when you have to consider the fact that there are real people living here.

I want to show a little bit about how we develop the Arctic and show some of the activity. Some of the technology we have developed—and I know the occupant of the chair is quite familiar with it—that is used now more often than not is called directional drilling.

This was an article that appeared in the New York Times, and it shows how