



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 148

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, MARCH 1, 2002

No. 20

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, March 4, 2002, at 2 p.m.

Senate

FRIDAY, MARCH 1, 2002

The Senate met at 9:15 a.m., and was called to order by the Honorable JEAN CARNAHAN, a Senator from the State of Missouri.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Loving Father, You have shown us that the antidote to pride is praise. In this time of prayer, we intentionally praise You for all that we might be tempted to think we have achieved or acquired on our own. Pride stunts our spiritual growth, creates tension in our relationships, and makes us difficult for You to bless. Thank You for breaking the bubble of the illusion that we are where we are because of our own cleverness or cunning. Humbly we acknowledge that we could not think a thought without Your guidance and inspiration or accomplish anything of lasting value without Your strength and courage. We dedicate this day to praise You for the privilege of serving You here in the Senate, for supernatural gifts of wisdom, discernment, and vision to maximize the talents that You have given us, and for the power to press on with opportunities that You have opened for us. All glory, honor, and praise be to You. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable JEAN CARNAHAN led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. BYRD).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, March 1, 2002.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable JEAN CARNAHAN, a Senator from the State of Missouri, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mrs. CARNAHAN thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Madam President, today the Senate is going to resume consideration of the election reform bill. There is scheduled at 9:45 a vote. Senators DODD and MCCONNELL control that time until then. We hope that, as Senator DODD has indicated, progress is being made on this bill. We should have announcements prior to 9:45 as to what the rest of the day will be.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

EQUAL PROTECTION OF VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 2001

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. 565, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 565) to establish a Commission on Voting Rights and Procedures to study and make recommendations regarding election technology, voting, and election administration, to establish a grant program under which the Office of Justice Programs and the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice shall provide assistance to States and localities in improving election technology and the administration of Federal elections, to require States to meet uniform and nondiscriminatory election technology and administration requirements for the 2004 Federal elections, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Clinton amendment No. 2906, to establish a residual ballot performance benchmark.

Dodd (for Schumer) modified amendment No. 2914, to permit the use of a signature or personal mark for the purpose of verifying the identity of voters who register by mail.

Dodd (for Kennedy) amendment No. 2916, to clarify the application of the safe harbor provisions.

Hatch amendment No. 2935, to establish the Advisory Committee on Electronic Voting and the Electoral Process, and to instruct the Attorney General to study the adequacy of existing electoral fraud statutes and penalties.

Hatch amendment No. 2936, to make the provisions of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 permanent.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S1379

Schumer/Wyden amendment No. 2937, to permit the use of a signature or personal mark for the purpose of verifying the identity of voters who register by mail. (By 46 yeas to 51 nays (Vote No. 38), Senate failed to table the amendment.)

Smith of New Hampshire amendment No. 2933, to prohibit the broadcast of certain false and untimely information on Federal elections.

Bond amendment No. 2940 (to amendment No. 2937), to permit the use of signature verification programs to verify the identity of individuals who register to vote by mail.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who yields time?

Mr. DODD. Madam President, I yield whatever time the Senator from Oregon may need.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I commend the Senator from Connecticut, who has just done yeoman work on what I think is a critical question; that is, finding common ground and the bipartisanship that is needed to pass this election reform bill.

I think the Senate has a clear choice this morning. A vote for cloture strengthens this Nation's greatest freedom—the right to vote. A vote against cloture weakens that freedom and it weakens a freedom that is critical for this country and leaves that freedom unprotected.

I believe this morning's vote is a choice between affirming the pioneering spirit of this country—the spirit that led my State of Oregon to champion new voting reforms, such as vote by mail, motor voter laws—and stamping out that spirit with what could end up to be repressive antivoting rules.

So the choice is between election reform and gridlock. I want to be fair with the Senator from Connecticut and we are going to continue to work non-stop, relentlessly, to find a bipartisan approach to this issue. We want to blaze a real trail in meaningful election reform and get this bill on the President's desk.

So I urge my colleagues on both sides to continue to work on this critical effort, to join the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Kentucky in an effort to get a bipartisan solution.

I don't want to see this bill derailed. S. 565 is the vehicle that can enfranchise the thousands, perhaps millions of voters who will cast their ballots in every election. But we also need to make sure that there is a fix to S. 565. The photo identification requirement, in my view, would disenfranchise millions of first-time voters by requiring identifying documents to be presented along with their vote—not their registration, but their vote—before that vote could be counted. This would have applied to first-time voters even if they had cast ballots for 50 years in a jurisdiction and then moved down the street to another.

The amendment approved by the Senate allows the signature verification system used by 27 States and the District of Columbia as one option for

identifying first-time voters. The amendment I drafted with the Senator from New York, Mr. SCHUMER, protected successful vote-by-mail systems such as the one in my home State and ensured that Americans who may not have access to driver's licenses, bank accounts, and utility bills would still have access to democracy.

There doesn't seem to be any point to rehashing the Schumer-Wyden amendment this morning. A majority of this body acknowledged that allowing signature verification would protect the voting rights of 24 million seniors in this country who disproportionately vote by absentee and mail-in ballot.

The majority of this body agreed with the eloquent assertion of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights that "requiring voters to present photo ID or other documentation when voting in person or by mail results in discrimination"—that it "would undermine successful vote by mail programs—such as Oregon's . . . and . . . make voting more difficult for millions of elderly and disabled Americans."

A majority of this body refused to overturn the will of Oregon voters and scores of others across this country. In my home State, 70 percent chose to institute a vote-by-mail system based on signature verification, a vote-by-mail system that has boosted turnout to record levels—without deterring voting.

A majority of this body refused to return to the bad old days when only Americans who were already enfranchised could be assured that their vote could be cast and counted.

Most importantly, a majority of this body recognized that being tough on fraud doesn't have to make it tougher to vote. Since approval of our amendment, I have worked with Senator Schumer, Senators DODD, BOND, and MCCONNELL to continue to find a way to meet our colleagues halfway. I have said that I think the framework for a compromise is to strengthen antifraud measures at the front end of the process, when people register and when you do the most good in terms of deterring fraud. I think tougher identification standards at that point in the registration—something the Senator from Missouri has felt strongly about—makes sense and I want to see that happen.

I believe compromise is possible, that we can, on a bipartisan basis, come together, put the voting rights of Americans first, whether they vote by mail or in person, and find ways to stop fraud without putting up roadblocks to democracy.

I ask unanimous consent to have a number of editorials and letters printed in the RECORD supporting the amendment that I and Senator SCHUMER authored.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal]

SENATE DEMOCRATS AIM FOR COMPROMISES TO SAVE BILL OVERHAULING VOTING SYSTEM

(By David Rogers)

WASHINGTON.—In a last ditch effort to save election-law overhaul legislation, Senate Democrats will seek to compromise on Republican demands for provisions to prevent voter fraud, despite protests from civil-rights and Hispanic groups.

At issue is a proposal to require people who register by mail to present photo identification or other documentation when they first vote in a jurisdiction. Democrats won a 51-46 roll call Wednesday to ease the proposed rules, but the outcome so angered some Republicans that the entire bill was put in jeopardy by a threatened filibuster.

After hours of sometimes tempestuous discussions with civil-rights groups, Senate Rules Committee Chairman Christopher Dodd (D., Conn.) said last night that he is prepared to give ground to the GOP in hope of completing debate and moving to the next step: negotiations with the House and the Bush Administration. Talks continued into the evening with Republican staff in hopes an agreement can be taken to the full Senate this morning.

As outlined by Mr. Dodd, tougher voter-ID requirements would be preserved under the compromise. But the effective date would be delayed until 2004, when the bill also requires states to take steps to better protect the rights of voters who may be challenged at the polls.

The most important of those so-called insurance provisions is the requirement that all states adopt provisional-voting systems for people who claim to be eligible, but aren't on the official registration list. Rather than be turned away outright, an individual in this case would be given a provisional ballot so that if his or her claim is later verified, the vote would be counted.

Minority lawmakers and civil-rights groups were themselves sometimes divided. At one juncture, Rep. Corrine Brown, an African-American Democrat, delivered an emotional appeal for the bill, given the balloting problems in her own state of Florida during the 2000 election.

Rep. Silvestre Reyes (D., Texas), chairman of the House Hispanic Caucus, lent crucial support to Mr. Dodd's decision, which ran in the face of opposition from groups such as the Mexican-American Legal Defense and Education Fund.

Mr. Reyes said the voter-ID provisions are the most difficult for Hispanics because many lack photo identification and don't have easy access to substitute documents. For example, the bill would allow a voter to use his or her utility bill as a form of identification. But Mr. Reyes said that since many Hispanics live together as extended families, not all household members would have a utility bill in their name.

Under the bill, the federal government would for the first time provide funding—\$3.5 billion over five years under the Senate version—to help states and localities buy new voting equipment and address such problems as occurred in Florida.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION

OF RETIRED PERSONS,

Washington, DC, February 12, 2002.

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: We are writing to express our firm support for the bipartisan election reform legislation (S. 565 substitute) that you jointly cosponsored with Senators Dodd, McConnell, Durbin, Bond, Toricelli, McCain, Schumer and Brownback. AARP urges you to support passage of the bill. While the S. 565

substitute can be improved, it contains the critical building blocks to reform and enhance the nation's voting system. Enactment of S. 565 should minimize the likelihood of a recurrence of the problems that plagued the Presidential Election of 2000.

We support the Dodd/McConnell substitute because it addresses the following core AARP concerns: Enhancement of civil rights protections; improved registration & balloting technology; improved elections administrative procedures; and provision of Federal funds to encourage state & local reforms.

Equally important, Dodd/McConnell establishes minimum standards of accountability and enforcement.

The bill includes measures critical to older persons, people with disabilities, and minority populations, such as: The ability to verify that their ballots actually reflect their voting preferences; enhanced access to registration opportunities, polling places, and user-friendly equipment; fail-safe provisional ballots to avoid erroneous voter denials; centralized, statewide registration lists to assist in voter confirmation; and funds for better election administration, including voting equipment upgrades, poll site access enhancement and poll worker training.

At the same time, some of the antifraud provisions in Dodd/McConnell need modification in order to assure existing civil rights protections and reduce technical loopholes that might discourage or intimidate potential voters. The bill's photo ID requirements are particularly problematic. Alternative approaches such as signature match and verification, already successfully used by many states, could enhance the anti-fraud provisions without having a chilling effect on voter participation. We strongly urge you to support both the Manager's amendment and a floor amendment that would correct these shortcomings in an otherwise strong, balanced and comprehensive election reform bill.

We appreciate your support in making these reforms in our elections process a reality. AARP look forward to working with the Senate to further our most basic right as citizens—the vote. If you have any questions, please feel free to call me or have your staff contact Larry White of our Federal Affairs staff at (202) 434-3800.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM D. NOVELLI,
Executive Director and CEO.

NATIONAL HISPANIC
LEADERSHIP AGENDA,

Washington, DC, February 11, 2002.

Re the Dodd-McConnell Substitute Amendment to S. 565—The Equal Protection of Voting Rights Act of 2001.

DEAR SENATOR: As members of the National Hispanic Leadership Agenda (NHLEA), a non-partisan coalition of 39 national Hispanic organizations and distinguished individuals, we are writing to urge you to support provisions in the Dodd-McConnell bill which improve access to voting for Latino voters and oppose the photo identification requirement (Section 103(b)), which would have a discriminatory effect on Latino voters. Unless Section 103(b) is fixed, the NHLEA will urge you to oppose the bill.

NHLEA supports many of the bill's provisions, particularly those provisions which set national minimum standards regarding voting systems, provisional balloting, and statewide registration lists. While some states already have laws in these areas, too many states do not. It is time that Congress step in and set some basic standards that ensure that voting is more accessible to all eligible voters no matter in which state they

live. Voting is the cornerstone of our democracy. By voting in favor of these provisions, you are voting in favor of an inclusive democracy.

NHLEA vigorously opposes Section 103(b) of the bill, which would require voters who register and vote for the first time in a jurisdiction to produce either a photo ID or one of only five limited documents either in person or by including a copy with their ballot. Latino voters are likely to be subject to this provision frequently since we move often, have a significant number of youth turning 18, and have a high number of new citizens. Also, Latino voters are less likely to have the documents required. A Massachusetts federal court recently struck down a requirement similar to the provision in the bill because it would have a discriminatory impact on Hispanic voters under the Voting Rights Act (VRA). The Justice Department has also opposed similar measures under the VRA.

We are truly befuddled as to why the Senate would want to take steps to disenfranchise Hispanic voters at this time. The 2000 Census showed the demographic power of the Latino community, and the 2000 and 2001 election cycles demonstrated that our demographic force is converting into a political force. Also, the trends and polls indicate that Hispanic voters are more open to voting for the best candidate to represent them, regardless of party affiliation. At a time when both parties are reaching out to this growing electorate, it is the wrong time to adopt a measure that would make it harder to vote.

We urge you to vote for an amendment to either strike Section 103(b) or fix it by adding in the alternatives of collecting signatures that can be verified or collecting an attestation. We will score the vote on the amendment in our NHLEA congressional scorecard. If the provision is not fixed, we urge you to oppose the bill, and we will score the vote on the final passage of the bill.

Moises Perez, Exec. Director, Alianza Dominicana; Gumersindo Salas, Vice Pres., Hispanic Association of Colleges & Universities; Oscar Sanchez, Exec. Director, Labor Council for Latin American Advancement; Jack Ienna, Interamerican College of Physicians & Surgeons; Roger Rivera, Pres., National Hispanic Environmental Council; Manuel Olivarez, Pres. & CEO, National Association of Hispanic Federal Executives; Alma Morales-Riojas, Pres., MANA, A National Latina Organization; Zeke Montes, Pres., National Association of Hispanic Publications; Manuel Mirabal, Chair, National Hispanic Leadership Agenda & Pres. & CEO, National Puerto Rican Coalition, Inc.; Juan Figueroa, Pres. & General Counsel, Puerto Rican Legal Defense & Educational Fund; Elena Rios, M.D., Pres., National Hispanic Medical Association; Gilbert Moreno, Pres. & CEO Association for the Advancement of Mexican Americans; Delia Pompa, Exec. Director, National Association for Bilingual Education; Brent Wilkes, Exec. Director, League of United Latin American Citizens; Maria E. Mills-Torres, Pres., National Conference of Puerto Rican Women; Raul Yzaguirre, Pres., National Council of La Raza; Syddia Lee-Chee, Latino Civil Rights Center; and Antonia Hernandez, Press. & General Counsel, Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund.

THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN
VOTERS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, February 11, 2002.

To: Members of the U.S. Senate.

From: Carolyn Jefferson-Jenkins, Ph.D., President.

Re: Election Reform.

The League of Women Voters urges you to support the bipartisan election reform bill

developed by Senators Dodd, McConnell, Bond and Schumer. The legislation will be offered as a substitute to S. 565. While the substitute is not perfect, it contains the key elements needed to improve our nation's election systems.

The 2000 election demonstrated that basic reforms are needed at the federal, state and local levels to protect voters and to improve election administration. It is also clear that it is time for the federal government to pay its fair share of the costs of administering federal elections.

The Dodd-McConnell substitute provides for basic national standards in vital, but limited, areas. It provides substantial federal funds for election reform efforts. And it provides a blueprint on which federal, state and local efforts can be built.

To protect voters and improve administration, the substitute provides for minimum national standards in three areas. First, voting systems standards will assure that voters can verify and correct their ballots, as well as be notified of overvotes. These standards also protect against high voting machine error rates and enhance access for persons with disabilities. Second, a national standard will assure that voters can receive provisional ballots. This fail-safe system means that if a voter's name is not found on the registration list at the polls, or if other problems occur, the voter can still cast a ballot that will be counted if the voter's eligibility is confirmed. Third, statewide computerized voter registration lists will be required. This facilitates removal of duplicate registration across jurisdictions, provides greater assurance that names will be on the rolls, and streamlines administration while combating possible fraud.

The substitute provides funding through state grants programs that will be developed with public involvement. Funds are provided not only for meeting standards, but also for other vital areas of election administration, including poll worker training and providing access to the polls for persons with disabilities. The substitute sets up a new federal commission that can provide effective guidance, while Justice Department enforcement of voter protection laws, such as the Voting Rights Act, is maintained.

While the substitute is a strong bill, it contains a photo ID requirement that will result in discrimination and create real administrative problems at polling places. Though the requirement is described as an anti-fraud device, effective alternatives exist to meet anti-fraud objectives that will not undermine voter participation through absentee balloting by persons with disabilities, seniors and others. We strongly urge you to correct this provision. We are also concerned that the so-called "safe harbor" provisions of the bill will have unintended, deleterious consequences.

The League of Women Voters believes that the Senate must act expeditiously on this important topic. We urge you to move ahead with the Dodd-McConnell substitute, which is clearly preferable to the House-passed bill in setting a workable structure for reform and creating an effective election commission.

America deserves an election system that will protect the most basic and precious right of all citizens in a democracy—the right to vote. Each citizen's right to vote, and to have that vote fairly counted, is at state.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 1, 2002]

FIXING THE VOTE

Last December Sen. Charles Schumer (D-N.Y.) helped broker a bipartisan election reform bill in the Senate; "this is a bill that

works, this is a bill that can pass," he said. Now Mr. Schumer has proposed an amendment to that bill, and Republicans say he is damaging the chances of a post-Florida fix for the nation's creaky voting system. But the truth is that the Schumer amendment would improve the bill. Republicans should contain their sense of betrayal and support the measure in the procedural vote scheduled for today. The electoral system will be the better for it.

The Schumer amendment fixes an anti-fraud provision in the election bill. The provision says that new voters, including those who have moved to a different county, must verify their identity by showing a photo ID, a utility bill or some other official document with their address on it. This provision may have the good effect of preventing some fraud. But it also may disqualify voters with no driver's license and no utility bills in their own name—and this group of potentially disqualified voters is much bigger than the likely number of fraudulent ballots.

Some 3 million disabled people are thought not to have driver's licenses or other qualifying picture IDs, and many of them may live in homes where the utility bills go to some other member of the household. Poor people without cars and settled homes may be disenfranchised too. The anti-fraud provision also threatens the vote-by-mail systems in Oregon, Washington and Colorado. It would require voters to photocopy proof of identity and send it in along with the ballot. But some voters live out of convenient range of photocopiers. Others may be put off by the sheer hassle.

The Schumer amendment would fix this danger by allowing states to accept other types of proof of identity—for example, a signature. It would also impose the identity requirement on fewer people—only new voters and those who have moved across state lines, and not those who have just changed counties. This is a good amendment that would significantly cut the risk of disqualifying eligible voters while only marginally increasing the risk of fraud. The Senate should adopt it, and then proceed quickly to pass the election reform bill. The 2000 contest demonstrated that hundreds of thousands of voters are deprived of their rights by a system that is broken. It is past time to fix it.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I do believe that a vote for cloture strengthens this country's greatest freedom—the right to vote—and a vote against cloture leaves that freedom unprotected. A vote for cloture is a vote for the millions of seniors in American nursing homes who need to vote by mail and don't want new barriers to have their votes counted and assured. Their generation saved this democracy and they deserve to participate in it.

A vote for cloture is a vote for working families who use the vote-by-mail system in my State and others as a way to have their voices heard as they live the hectic lives that often present challenges to their getting to the polls. This morning, I urge my colleagues to affirm America's most precious right—the right of every citizen to vote and to have that vote count. I want to wrap up—particularly since my good friend from Pennsylvania is in the Chamber—by reemphasizing my desire to work with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, Senator BOND and Senator MCCONNELL. I have strong views about this issue. We want to work with our colleagues and talk about whether

those on the other side of the aisle want a bill. I have stuck up for my colleagues. I think they want a bill and I want to make it clear that I think Senators BOND and MCCONNELL are working very hard with us to try to find the common ground. I hope we can get there, and I believe cloture will help advance that.

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

Mr. WYDEN. I yield to my friend for a question.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I thank the distinguished Senator. My question relates to the provisions of the underlying bill, as I understand it, providing that a voter may establish identity by either photo identification, a bank statement, utility bill, paycheck, government check, or any other check, or any other government document which shows the name and address. Is that the Senator's understanding?

Mr. WYDEN. My colleague is right. It is the basic proposition that there are a number of systems by which we can address this concern. There is a reason that groups such as AARP still believe that, even with the measure the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania has outlined, the legislation without the Schumer-Wyden amendment still creates barriers. We have people in vote-by-mail systems—seniors, the disabled—who find it awfully hard, physically, to get about and locate the kind of documents the Senator is talking about.

Mr. SPECTER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WYDEN. Yes.

Mr. SPECTER. The further question is: The amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from New York would put in the disjunctive one other way of establishing identity and that is, by signature alone—is that correct?

Mr. WYDEN. Of course, in my home State of Oregon, what we have tried to do is to have a tough system at the front end. But, yes, when you sign your ballot and mail it in, and there is a statement about the tough criminal penalties that are involved in falsification there, we prosecute people in the State of Oregon. You can send your ballot in by signing it, and that is then checked against the original signature. That is how it takes place in my home State.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, a further question I have of the Senator from Oregon is: How do you prosecute someone where there is a registration by signature and then subsequent voting by signature?

By way of background, I have had considerable experience in prosecuting vote fraud cases, having been in the Philadelphia district attorney's office for 12 years, 4 as assistant and 8 as district attorney. Philadelphia is a rough town with political corruption, and I have prosecuted both Democrats and Republicans.

When you talk about a signature alone, having been registered with the signature and then a signature comes in, there is no way to find that person. The difficulty is that it may be a dead person. Graveyard voting is very popular in Philadelphia—voting people who have died. It is also very popular to have people registered by signature who were never in existence.

I ask my colleague from Oregon, how can you conduct a prosecution—I could never figure out how to—how can you conduct a prosecution, if you have a registration by signature and then you have a signature come in on the card? You cannot find the person. To have a prosecution, you have to have a defendant, you have to have a warrant of arrest identifying somebody, and you have to pick somebody up. How can there possibly be a prosecution for someone who sends in a signature of somebody who never existed?

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I say to my friend from Pennsylvania, there have been a number of prosecutions. They, obviously, as my colleague knows from his prosecutorial days, play out in a variety of ways.

For example, I know of an instance where the person was out bragging that they had skirted the law, they were evading the law, and when the prosecutors learned about it, they came down very hard.

The point is—and my colleague makes a good point with respect to how these systems may work in Pennsylvania—Senator SMITH, my friend and colleague, and I had a Senate special election. We generated three times the level of voter participation than we saw in the previous Senate special election. I won by a grand total of 18,220 votes after more than 1 million were cast.

Mr. SPECTER. Any braggarts among those?

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

Mr. WYDEN. I ask for 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, to my colleague's great credit, he did not assert there was any fraud. We prosecute aggressively in the State of Oregon.

I see my colleague from Missouri is in the Chamber, and I want him to be assured, however this vote turns out this morning, we are going to continue to work relentlessly for a bipartisan compromise.

I urge my colleagues to vote for cloture. I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who yields time?

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I ask for 4 minutes.

Mr. BOND. Madam President, how many minutes remain on this side?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Twelve and a half minutes remain.

Mr. BOND. I will be happy to yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. I increase my request to 6 minutes.

Mr. BOND. We will offer 2½ minutes. I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Pennsylvania.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I engaged in a colloquy with the Senator from Oregon to show we really cannot prosecute anyone successfully on this signature arrangement. You register by signature, nobody ever sees the person, and you vote by the signature. The person could be dead or never in existence.

On the one case the Senator from Oregon cites of the braggart case, if somebody admits it, you can prosecute anybody if you are going to have confessions. But, that is not the way criminal law cases arise. In the 12 years I was in the district attorney's office, I never saw somebody who came in and confessed to having committed vote fraud. To prosecute those cases, you have to have evidence and there is no realistic way to obtain it.

I was listening to the majority leader, Senator DASCHLE, on the radio this morning on a playback of a news conference he had yesterday in which he said that the position staked out by Senator BOND requiring photo identification was just too difficult, referring to people in his own State.

But the fact of the matter is, the underlying bill which was worked out in the compromise does not require photo identification. Photo identification is one way. There could be a bank statement, a utility bill, a paycheck, a government check, or any other government document showing an address, showing a person is in existence. If the underlying bill required a photo identification, I would say that is too difficult. There are many other ways to establish that the person actually is in existence, but the signature simply does not accomplish that.

Nobody has a better record than I on voting rights. In my 22 years in the Senate, I have pushed that consistently. Against many in my party, I have supported motor voter. I want to see the ballot as widespread as possible, but people who want to make it easy to register with motor voter are going to lose it, if there is not some realistic way to prevent fraud.

Frankly, I do not like to see filibusters, but we are on a very basic proposition as to whether we can have widespread fraud without any way to identify whether the person is in existence or not. I think the Schumer-Wyden amendment simply cannot be accepted.

If there are overtones that the bill is going to be pulled if this amendment is not accepted, it seems to me that very frequently—I ask for an additional 25 seconds.

Mr. BOND. I will be happy to yield half a minute to my colleague from Pennsylvania.

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

Mr. SPECTER. Any suggestion that the whole bill is going to go down over this amendment—the Democrats control the Rules Committee; they have a majority. They have come out with a bill which they have controlled, and that bill ought to be enacted if this amendment cannot survive a cloture vote.

I thank my colleague from Missouri, and I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Madam President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his excellent work on this bill. As a former prosecutor in a State that has not been a stranger to vote fraud, he knows how difficult it is, and he has made a very compelling case for our efforts to eliminate fraud in this bill.

We have had an interesting dueling set of editorials today that have come out in some of the papers on the east coast. We do not read a lot of them in Missouri, but the Washington Post is the one that did not get it. The Washington Post said:

Republicans should contain their sense of betrayal and support the measure.

They go on to say that without the Schumer amendment, it would disqualify a number of voters.

No. 1, Madam President, sense of betrayal counts for something here and counts for something back home. It may not matter to editorial board writers within the beltway, but when we make a deal, as we made a deal, a bipartisan deal after accommodations on both sides, I expect that people will stay with that deal.

Somebody said: You made a deal, but now we want you to start negotiating again. I said: Wait a minute, we do not work that way.

We came in good faith to an agreement, and we agreed with the proposition that we ought to make sure everybody who is eligible to vote is registered and can vote.

The Washington Post just flat gets it wrong when it says there are going to be people who cannot qualify. Ninety percent of adult Americans have a driver's license. You have to show identification to get on a plane, to rent a video, to buy cigarettes.

Why can't you have some minimal identification to assure that you are a live human being entitled to vote, and entitled to vote only once in every important election?

Well, we have agreed that with the money we are providing to States, if somebody does not have a photo identification, a driver's license, a government check, a bank account, a utility bill, a pay stub, we are providing the money for the States to issue an election card.

We are worried about all the people in nursing homes. No. 1, everybody who

is registered is going to stay registered. The Senator from New York pointed out the problems they had with crowded rolls. We do need to work on purging. I voted against the amendment by my colleague from Montana; he wanted to make it easier to purge no longer active voters from the rolls. I think it was a good idea, but because we had a deal, I voted against his amendment. We are, as the Senator from New York pointed out, going to have to clean it up.

Incidentally, speaking of the Senator from New York, he assured us yesterday—and I am glad to see he is in the Chamber—there was no fraud in New York. Well, I do not know anything about New York, but the Wall Street Journal this morning points out the doubledippers sign up to vote in New York and Florida, and they report that an investigation turned up 286 individuals who voted both in New York City and in Florida last November in the 2000 election. Since you can figure that New York City voters generally vote 3 to 1 Democratic, that means at least 140 fraudulent votes for the Gore-Lieberman ticket in Florida.

One other thing. Somebody gave me a copy of the New York Daily News: Double Take in Ballot Probe. Voters With Same Name and Birthday Expose New York System.

Seventy-five voters with the same name and same date of birth registered to vote in Brooklyn and either Rockland or Orange Counties. Fourteen actually voted in more than one county, sometimes in the same election.

It describes how the double voting and the double registration occurs in some areas with heavy Democratic votes. So there are some problems, but frankly we do not have time to go into it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. BOND. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed 1 additional minute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, how much time remains on this side?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Three minutes fourteen seconds.

Mr. BOND. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Daily News article, the Wall Street Journal editorial, the Washington Post editorial, and a New York Times editorial which says Americans should be willing to verify their identity in order to exercise the right to vote, and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch article on the famous dog Ritzzy Mekler, whose owner says she, Ritzzy, does not want any other dogs voting, be printed in the RECORD.

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

From the Washington Post, Mar. 1, 2002

FIXING THE VOTE

Last December Sen. Charles Schumer (D-N.Y.) helped broker a bipartisan election reform bill in the Senate; "this is a bill that

works, this is a bill that can pass," he said. Now Mr. Schumer has proposed an amendment to that bill, and Republicans say he is damaging the chances of a post-Florida fix for the nation's creaky voting system. But the truth is that the Schumer amendment would improve the bill. Republicans should contain their sense of betrayal and support the measure in the procedural vote scheduled for today. The electrical system will be the better for it.

The Schumer amendment fixes an anti-fraud provision in the election bill. The provisions says that new voters, including those who have moved to a different county, must verify their identity by showing a photo ID, a utility bill or some other official document with their address on it. This provision may have the good effect of preventing some fraud. But it also may disqualify voters with no driver's license and no utility bills in their own name—and this group of potentially disqualified voters is much bigger than the likely number of fraudulent ballots.

Some 3 million disabled people are thought not to have driver's licenses or other qualifying picture IDs, and many of them may live in homes where the utility bills go to some other member of the household. Poor people without cars and settled homes may be disenfranchised too. The anti-fraud provision also threatens the vote-by-mail systems in Oregon, Washington and Colorado. It would require voters to photocopy proof of identity and send it in along with the ballot. But some voters live out of convenient range of photocopiers. Others may be put off by the sheer hassle.

The Schumer amendment would fix this danger by allowing states to accept other types of proof of identity—for example, a signature. It would also impose the identity requirement on fewer people—only new voters and those who have moved across state lines, and not those who have just changed counties. This is a good amendment that would significantly cut the risk of disqualifying eligible voters while only marginally increasing the risk of fraud. The Senate should adopt it, and then proceed quickly to pass the election reform bill. The 2000 contest demonstrated that hundreds of thousands of voters are deprived of their rights by a system that is broken. It is past time to fix it.

[From the Daily News]

DOUBLE TAKE IN BALLOT PROBE—VOTERS WITH SAME NAME & BIRTHDAY EXPOSE N.Y. SYSTEM

(By Bob Port and Greg B. Smith)

Yitchok Levovits, whose birthday is Dec. 29, 1970, voted in Brooklyn's Hasidic neighborhood of Williamsburg on Election Day, November 1996.

Forty miles away in the Rockland County Hasidic community of Monsey, Yitchok Levovits, whose birthday is Dec. 29, 1970, voted in the same election.

The question of residence came up again in November when Yitchok Levovits voted in the general election in Monsey even though last week he was found living in Brooklyn.

Levovits is one of 75 voters with the same name and same date of birth registered to vote in Brooklyn and either Rockland or Orange counties, a Daily News investigation found.

Of that number 14 actually voted in more than one county sometimes in the same election according to a computer analysis of voter registration records.

Several registered in one county shortly before voting in another. Some registered to vote in one county then voted in another.

The Daily News reported yesterday that during the last election, there was evidence of similar voting irregularities in the Rock-

land County Hasidic community of New Square. That contributed to an overwhelming 1,400-to-12 New Square vote for Sen. Hillary Clinton that is now under investigation by federal prosecutors.

But the irregularities appear to extend beyond New Square into other Hasidic communities in Brooklyn's Williamsburg, Rockland County's Monsey and Orange County's Monroeville.

The New found that in New York it's easy to pull off double voting because—unlike many other states—New York has no nationwide system for registering voters.

Each county has a separate registration system, and no one checks to see if a voter is registered and voting in two spots.

"There is no computer link. Some of the upstate counties aren't even on computer," said Steven Richman, general counsel to the New York City Board of Elections.

For instance, Jacob Fligman, whose birthday is July 29, 1953, voted in the general election of 1998 in both Brooklyn and Monsey. He also voted in November in Monsey, but this week he was found at his apartment in Brooklyn.

In all, seven men voted in elections in both Brooklyn and Rockland County throughout the 1990s, raising questions about whether they properly voted in November's election.

Israel Reich voted in Brooklyn in 1997 and 1998, and this week he was found at his apartment on Wythe Ave. in Williamsburg. He voted in Monsey in November.

Chaim Pinkasovits voted in November in Monsey, though his name was listed this week on a mailbox at his apartment on Hooper St. in Brooklyn's Williamsburg.

Jacob Weber voted in the November election in Monsey, but last week a neighbor said he lived in an apartment on Heyward St. in Williamsburg.

New York Attorney General Eliot Spitzer has called for a statewide voter registration system that would make it easier for voters to register, but also "enable election officials to curb election fraud."

Spitzer's report, issued in February, specifically noted state wide registration would "curb multiple voting."

[From the New York Times, Mar. 1, 2002]

VOTE FOR VOTING REFORMS

All week, partisan wrangling over the question of preventing electoral fraud threatened to kill the Senate's sensible election reform bill, though a compromise seemed within reach late yesterday. Differences over the fraud issue do not justify scuttling the overall bill, the product of year-long, painstaking negotiations. The resulting bipartisan legislation goes a long way toward curing the deficiencies in the nation's balloting process that became manifest in the 2000 presidential election. Senate leaders must ensure that the vote on electoral reform proceeds, and should encourage members to support it overwhelmingly.

The legislation establishes federal standards for voting procedures and technologies that state and local election officials would have to meet when administering national elections, and it provides \$3.5 billion over five years to pay for the upgrade. The bill forces states to meet federally mandated error rates for their voting equipment, provide provisional ballots when someone's eligibility is questioned at the polls and allow people an opportunity to correct improperly marked ballots. The bill's anti-fraud provisions were necessary to gain key Republican support late last year for such a forceful federal intrusion into the states' traditional prerogative of running elections. When Senators Charles Schumer and Ron Wyden, both Democrats, offered a last-minute amend-

ment to remove the bill's requirement for first-time voters who register by mail to identify themselves at the polls, the measure's Republican sponsors, Christopher Bond and Mitch McConnell, felt their Democratic colleagues were renegeing on the deal, and they threatened to filibuster the legislation.

Both sides would be foolish to allow the fight over this amendment to kill the legislation. Republicans should know that forcing states to maintain computerized statewide voter lists, a key item in the bill, does more than the disputed provision itself to combat fraud, eliminating as it does duplicate registrations in several counties.

The Schumer-Wyden amendment was strongly supported by a coalition of civil rights groups that say the burden of having to produce a photo identification card or an alternative proof of identity, like a utility bill, disproportionately hurts minority voters, recent immigrants, students and people with disabilities. Their legitimate concerns must be balanced against the need to safeguard the integrity of the process.

Americans should be willing to verify their identity in order to exercise their right to vote. Senators Schumer and Wyden are wisely seeking an accommodation with Republicans, even if it means leaving much of the original provision intact. The Senate must move ahead now and pass this needed reform.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 1, 2002]

SHOULD DOGS VOTE?

Dogs and dead people don't have a constitutional right to vote, but more of them are going to start turning up at the polls if Senate Democrats, led by New York's Charles Schumer, have their way.

It wasn't supposed to come to this. Following the Florida 2000 debacle both parties were eager to fix the system. The House did its part by passing a bipartisan bill last year. And then in December, after months of negotiations, Senator Christopher Bond (R., Mo.) and Mr. Schumer announced that the Senate, too, had reached a compromise. Their bill, said Mr. Schumer, would allot \$3.5 billion for states and localities to upgrade voting systems, improve registration procedures and educate voters about ballots.

It would also target voter fraud, which has been on the increase since the 1993 Motor Voter Law allowed people to register to vote while applying for a driver's license. Unfortunately, some 95% of Motor Voter registrants don't vote, but their names are available for political operatives and others to misuse. A St. Louis dog once registered. The Senate bill requires those who register by mail and are voting for the first time to prove their identity.

Acceptable proof of identity would include photo ID, a utility bill, a bank statement, a government check, a pay check, or any government document showing the name and address of the voter. This is not a requirement that every voter show up at the polls with a photo ID. The measures would apply only to first-time mail-in registrants.

These antifraud measures, which were acceptable to Democrats two months ago, are somehow now unacceptable; Mr. Schumer this week introduced an amendment that strips away the mail-in registrant requirements. And on the Senate floor yesterday he announced that his home state is practically fraud free.

"In New York," said Mr. Schumer, "We have not had—I checked again yesterday, we called around the state. We called people, not just on one party or another . . . There's been almost no allegation of any kind of fraud with our system." Perhaps he thinks that all of the political cheats in the Northeast live in New Jersey.

Alas, the Senator failed to call one of his hometown newspaper, the New York Post, which reported two years ago in a story headlined "Double-Dippers Sign Up to Vote in N.Y. and Florida" that "New York City [alone] has 11,642 voters with illegal dual registrations." An investigation of voting records in New York and Florida by the Republican National Committee, which the Senator also apparently failed to ring, has turned up 286 names of individuals who double-voted in November 2000.

Mr. Schumer would prefer that states verify voter identities through signature matching. Not only would this be a costly provision—34 states currently don't use signature verification and would have to purchase the technology—but it would also require that the nation's 1.4 million poll workers double as hand-writing experts.

The truth is that Senate Democrats are trying to torpedo a bill they helped write due to pressure from civil rights groups such as the NAACP and La Raza. The activists claim that requiring proof that a voter is a real person is an "undue burden." They expect us to believe that the same ID requirements for, say, renting a video or buying a pack of cigarettes somehow disenfranchise the poor and elderly when it comes to casting a ballot.

Mr. Schumer's amendment passed in a largely partisan preliminary vote Wednesday, but Senate Republicans are planning to filibuster and we'd encourage them to do so. Someone has to make the case that the integrity of the ballot box is just as important to the credibility of elections as the access to it.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Mar. 1, 2002]

SPANIEL MAKES SENATE APPEARANCE IN
SUPPORT OF BOND'S REFORM EFFORTS
(By Deirdre Shesgreen)

WASHINGTON.—Ritzzy Mekler has given new bite to Sen. Christopher "Kit" Bond's election-reform crusade.

Ritzzy, a 13-year-old English springer spaniel, was Bond's Exhibit A on the floor of the Senate this week as the Missouri Republican pressed his case for anti-fraud provisions in legislation to overhaul the nation's voting system. The reason: When she was a younger pup, Ritzzy was registered to vote in St. Louis.

The dog's 1994 registration is one reason, in Bond's view, that St. Louis has a reputation for vote fraud. Other reasons are recent efforts to register several dead St. Louisans, including a prominent former alderman.

What does Ritzzy think about her sudden celebrity status?

"Ritzzy would like for their to be reform," deadpanned her owner, Margaret Mekler, a retired teacher who lives in St. Louis. "I don't think she wants any other dogs, including the ones in her own household, voting."

Mekler seconded her pet's position. "Our dog is very intelligent," she said, "but I'm not sure I want her voting on who's going to be the president."

Bond was pleased.

"I'm glad to have Ritzzy's support," he said. "I just don't want her votes."

Bond hoped to eliminate the animal vote through a provision in the legislation that would require first-time voters who register by mail to show a photo ID or other verification of their identity, such as a utility bill, before they vote.

But Democrats said that requirement would disenfranchise many voters—such as the elderly or immigrants—who don't have the necessary identification cards. Sens. Charles Schumer, D-N.Y., and Ron Wyden, D-Ore., offered an amendment that would allow voters to prove their identity by pro-

viding a signature that could be matched with a signature on record with local election authorities.

Bond said the amendment would "gut" his anti-fraud provisions.

He promptly trotted out a blown-up copy of Ritzzy's 1994 registration card to the Senate floor. With the card on prominent display, Bond said Schumer's amendment would do nothing to keep the pooch from casting a ballot.

"I have a feeling that whoever wrote Ritzzy Mekler on that registration form probably could duplicate that 'Ritzzy Mekler' signature each and every time they wanted to vote," said Bond as the debate opened earlier this week.

Schumer responded that there was no law Congress could pass to keep all dogs from voting.

"Ritzzy, whom we have heard a lot about, is going to find a way to vote illegally, incorrectly, whether we have this amendment or not," Schumer said. "All the owner of Ritzzy has to do is put a photo ID in that envelope."

Democrats won a preliminary vote on Schumer's amendment, prompting Bond and other Republicans to hold up the bill, which is now stalled.

Just how Ritzzy got onto the St. Louis voter rolls is still a mystery.

Mekler suspects it started when she and her husband put their phone number under Ritzzy's name because they didn't want their own names listed in the phone book.

Then they received a notice from the election board.

"... We got a voting notification that said that Ritzzy ... had been registered, unbeknownst to us," Mekler said. "The registration said she had moved here from California, she was 21, and had a Social Security number."

"We got the letter and we said 'Well, wait a minute, What is this?'" Mekler recalled.

Mekler, 56, suspects someone must have seen Ritzzy's name in the phone book and decided to register her, not knowing she was a dog.

As soon as they realized the mistake, the Meklers notified the election board.

St. Louis election officials said nobody by name of Ritzzy Mekler ever voted. "Ritzzy was removed (from the voting rolls) as soon as we received a call from Mr. Mekler," said Jeanne Bergfeld, assistant director of the Election Board.

Bergfeld also said she knew of no second attempted dog registration last year, as previous elections officials had reported after 3,800 suspect cards were dropped off at the Election Board just before the mayoral primary last March.

The cards included the deceased, but no canines, she said.

Mekler said she'd like stricter rules for voter identification, though not all members of her household agree.

"I hope (we) get some reform," she said. "If not, we have two other dogs and a cat who would like to register."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, the Wall Street Journal editorial this morning has accurately captured the essence of our vote this morning—"Dogs and dead people don't have the constitutional right to vote, but more of them are going to start turning up at the polls if Senate Democrats, led by New York's CHARLES SCHUMER, have their way."

The cloture vote today is not about whether we support election reform;

clearly everyone in this Chamber does. The cloture vote today is about ensuring the integrity of our elections—do we want to make it harder, or easier, to cheat.

Over 2 months ago Senators DODD, BOND, SCHUMER, TORRICELLI, and I introduced a bipartisan bill to make it easier to vote and harder to cheat. This compromise was the result of months and months of negotiations among the five of us.

Two weeks ago this bill was brought before the entire Senate for its consideration. But, on Tuesday night, after 5 days of debate on the bill, the Senator from New York, one of the principal negotiators and cosponsors of this compromise, offered an amendment which would eviscerate one of the key anti-fraud provisions of our deal.

The antifraud provisions in the compromise are due to the hard work of the Senator from Missouri, which I thought we all supported. He sought to ensure that when one talks about the *Spirit of St. Louis* they are referring to an airplane, not a dead voter.

This amendment was put to a vote on Wednesday morning and the three Democratic cosponsors of the bill voted in favor of gutting the antifraud provision. After months of negotiations, after more than 2 months between introduction and bringing it up on the floor, and after 5 days of debate, it appears our cosponsors did not really support the agreement after all.

The Senator from Missouri and I voted to support the compromise we had reached. That is what this vote today is all about.

This vote is as much about the sanctity of a compromise deal as it is about a person's right to vote, and do so only once.

A vote today against cloture is not a vote to kill election reform. To the contrary, it ensures effective and balanced reform.

Over the course of this 8-day debate we have addressed issues important to individuals Senators and their home States.

However, the Schumer amendment which brought this debate and this Chamber to a grinding halt, takes us all back to the first days of our negotiations over this compromise.

We already discussed, debated, and decided these issues once, and now my colleagues want to do it all over again but this time on the floor of the Senate.

My colleagues on this side of the aisle have serious concerns about some provisions of this bill, but we have been willing to work with the Senator from Connecticut to preserve the key provisions of the compromise.

This vote is all about the Schumer amendment, which would make it easier to cheat, impose the most expensive mandate on the states, and require 1.4 million poll workers to become hand-writing experts.

Quoting again from the Wall Street Journal:

Someone has to make the case that the integrity of the ballot box is just as important to the credibility of elections as the access to it.

I commend the Senator from Missouri from doing exactly that.

The Schumer amendment unravels the core agreement we had reached on election reform and has turned what we had hoped was going to be a largely bipartisan exercise into a partisan split, which will be evident in a few moments on the cloture vote.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on cloture. A vote against cloture is not a vote against election reform. It gives us the opportunity to continue to discuss the matter and hopefully work out this problem.

The Senator from Connecticut has spent an enormous amount of time on this issue, and so have I and other Senators, and we still would like to see a bill passed, but this is a critical point. The whole crux of this bill is to make it easier to vote and harder to cheat. What the Senator from Missouri has offered and has discussed—and the provision that was in the underlying bill is quite simply understood—is this deals with first-time registrants by mail only, that they be required to provide some identification so we can eliminate dead people and dogs from the rolls all across America. I do not think that is asking too much.

The sanctity of the vote is important to everyone, and to the extent dead people and dogs can vote, it diminishes obviously the votes of all the rest of us. So that is really what this is about. A vote no on cloture will give us the opportunity to continue to discuss this matter and hopefully get back to the original core compromise that brought us all together in the first place. Consequently, I urge my colleagues to vote no on the cloture motion that will be before us momentarily.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Connecticut be given 1 minute.

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

The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Madam President, so my colleagues know, we had hoped as a result of hours of negotiation—and I am not exaggerating—over the last 48 hours, we would resolve the issue at hand. I mentioned the other day the efforts have gone on for several weeks. Unfortunately, not everybody has seen every dotted “i” and crossed “t,” and obviously if that is the case, then we cannot get the unanimous consent necessary to either vitiate cloture or to withdraw amendments and consider others.

So we are in a situation where the rules of the Senate make it very difficult, if there is not complete agreement on everything, to move forward.

Let me say to those who are interested in where this debate is going, we

are very close to a resolution of this particular issue that has caused the stall on this bill. It is my fervent hope and belief that come the first of next week we will be able to complete action on this bill. When we get beyond this issue, there are several remaining issues that will need to be voted on. My view is none of them is of such a nature, whether adopted or defeated, that would go to in any way derail the process.

On the cloture vote, Members will vote for or against. At this point, it is a matter on which we are going to vote, but it does not go to the issue of whether we are voting for dead dogs or live people or dead people and live dogs. The issue is whether or not we are going to get to an agreement, and I believe we can.

I regret we did not have it done by this morning. I thought we had, but obviously we do not, and so I am disappointed by that fact. I am optimistic we can get there in the next couple of days.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for 30 seconds.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I add my remarks to those of the Senator from Connecticut. We are willing to compromise. We have worked fully. We have moved on the amendment that Senator WYDEN and I have to virtual agreement with what the Senator from Missouri wants. Let us not hold up this bill. We think that having the overall bill is more important than the amendment the Senator from Oregon and I offered. We want to try as best we can to protect voters, but we do not want the bill to go down. We do not want to use that as a pretext for killing this bill.

CLOTURE MOTION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the clerk will report the motion to invoke cloture.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate on S. 565, the election reform bill:

Christopher Dodd, Harry Reid, Charles Schumer, Ron Wyden, Debbie Stabenow, Patty Murray, Tom Daschle, Jeff Bingaman, Daniel Inouye, Carl Levin, Max Baucus, Joe Biden, Pat Leahy, James M. Jeffords, Barbara Mikulski, Bob Graham, Edward M. Kennedy.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on S. 565 relative to election reform shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are required under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, on this vote, I have a pair with the Senator from Nevada, Mr. ENSIGN. If he were present and voting, he would vote nay. If I were permitted to vote, I would vote yea. I, therefore, withhold my vote.

I further announce that the Senator from Georgia (Mr. MILLER) is necessarily absent.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK), the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. ENSIGN), the Senator from Texas (Mr. GRAMM), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. NICKLES) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that if present and voting the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS) would vote “no.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON of Florida). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 39 Leg.]

YEAS—49

Akaka	Dorgan	Lieberman
Baucus	Durbin	Lincoln
Bayh	Edwards	Mikulski
Biden	Feingold	Murray
Bingaman	Feinstein	Nelson (FL)
Boxer	Graham	Nelson (NE)
Breaux	Harkin	Reed
Byrd	Hollings	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Inouye	Sarbanes
Carnahan	Jeffords	Schumer
Carper	Johnson	Smith (OR)
Cleland	Kennedy	Stabenow
Clinton	Kerry	Torricelli
Conrad	Kohl	Wellstone
Corzine	Landrieu	Wyden
Dayton	Leahy	
Dodd	Levin	

NAYS—39

Allard	Fitzgerald	Roberts
Allen	Frist	Santorum
Bennett	Grassley	Sessions
Bond	Gregg	Shelby
Bunning	Hagel	Smith (NH)
Campbell	Hatch	Snowe
Chafee	Hutchinson	Specter
Cochran	Kyl	Stevens
Collins	Lott	Thomas
Crapo	Lugar	Thompson
Daschle	McCain	Thurmond
DeWine	McConnell	Voinovich
Domenici	Murkowski	Warner

PRESENT AND GIVING A LIVE PAIR—1

Reid, yea

NOT VOTING—11

Browback	Enzi	Inhofe
Burns	Gramm	Miller
Craig	Helms	Nickles
Ensign	Hutchison	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 49, the nays are 39. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by

which cloture was not invoked on S. 565.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

IDENTIFICATION BY DRIVER'S LICENSE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this afternoon many Members of Congress, many people across America will be headed to airports, and at the airport checkpoint they will be asked to show some form of a photo identification as well as a ticket. That is now the custom in America. It is something we have come to accept as part of our effort to make certain we have security on planes and in airports.

The most common form of identification which will be presented by passengers across America to prove their identity is their driver's license. More than any other documentation, that is what people use when they travel.

But, if we look to the question of the authenticity and integrity of a driver's license, I am afraid we find very troubling statistics and information. It seems that with very little effort and a minimum amount of money, virtually anyone in America can get a driver's license made with their picture on it. It may not be their real name. It may not have any accurate facts on it. But it will be a photo of some person with some name.

A driver's license, as the primary source of identification in America, is your ticket to enter our society. Once you have that driver's license and present it, you are in the system. You are recognized as part of the system.

You may want to get in the system for a variety of reasons. A person who is over 21 years old and wants to buy alcohol needs a driver's license to present so they can make that purchase. Someone who is in the business of stealing the identity of another person will want a driver's license with their photo on that other person's statistical information.

Of course, if your goal is even more sinister, a driver's license becomes critical. Timothy McVeigh knew that. That is why he used a phony driver's license when he rented the truck which he drove into Oklahoma City, blew up, and killed so many innocent people. Several of the 19 terrorists involved in

the September 11th attack also knew how important a phony driver's license was. They either obtained fake driver's licenses or licenses issued to them under false pretenses, which gave them access to a system, which started opening doors once the driver's license was in their name—or at least in some name with their photo.

When we debate this, a lot of people in America get nervous. If we are talking about identification cards, are we talking about a national identification card system? I am not proposing that at all. Some Members of Congress have. I am not one of them. But I do think there are things we can do that can strengthen the process of issuing driver's licenses all across America, which can make them more uniform, more authentic, more credible.

I am working on legislation, and I will be holding a hearing in the Governmental Affairs Committee in the coming weeks that will address this issue. I have worked with the administrators of State agencies across America. Every State agency with the responsibility of issuing driver's licenses is part of an association which has worked with me in an effort to come up with some standards across the States. When I walk into a DMV, whether it is in Illinois, New York, Georgia, or California, what do they ask to prove my identity? Is it a birth certificate? Is it a passport? What will really prove my identity?

I think establishing minimum uniformity in the way driver's licenses are issued State to State makes sense. It is going to eliminate forum shopping by those who are looking for the easiest State to provide counterfeit and illegal documents in the process of obtaining a driver's license. That is why I worked with the association to come up with minimum uniform standards, so that State to State everybody knows that a person applying for a driver's license has established their identity through the most credible means. If somebody comes to Illinois to apply for a driver's license and they produce documentation that indicates they once lived in another State, I think the State of Illinois should have an opportunity to have access to that other State and find out if there is a chance that person either applied for a driver's license which was suspended or revoked or that State has some information that may be of value to Illinois before issuing the license. I think this is an excellent starting point.

We are also working with States in terms of applying standardized verification requirements, such as validating source documents, for example. This includes authenticating the information provided, perhaps by cross-checking with other government agencies. So if somebody came and said, "Here is my birth certificate as part of the proof of who I am," there would be a way to establish how you would cross-check that to make certain the document was valid.

We are also working on ways to prevent tampering and counterfeiting of documents. This morning, on the CBS morning show, I was a guest of Bryant Gumbel. They featured a video segment where one of their reporters went to Los Angeles with \$150 in hand and started walking the streets and saying, "Where can I get a phony driver's license?" It didn't take long to find one. Within a short period of time, that phony license was prepared with the reporter's photo for \$150. Then he took that license and started buying airline tickets with that new name. He also got on several flights without anyone ever stopping him for using a phony document.

That tells you how easy it can be even with enhanced aviation security today. But there are ways to make these driver's licenses more secure so they can't be counterfeited and easily manipulated. There are also ways to authenticate the validity of the driver's license using very inexpensive equipment. I think that ought to be part of our goal as well.

We also need to establish tougher criminal penalties for those who would misuse driver's licenses, who would issue phonies, or those who, frankly, are part of a network that is trying to make a profit at the expense of identity. Senator BARBARA BOXER of California and I discussed this issue this morning. She has legislation that addresses some of these aspects and we are going to work together with her on that.

We also provide Federal whistleblower protection to those who uncover internal fraud or report suspicious activities involving State motor vehicle agencies. Why is this important? Look at what recently happened in Tennessee. There was a woman who—at least, it is alleged—was involved in an illegal scheme to sell driver's licenses, which is a very serious charge for somebody who had been a State employee in Tennessee. Then, under the most mysterious of circumstances, within a day of her expected court appearance, her car was set on fire, and she was killed. We have had instances in my State where people working at the driver's license stations have been bribed to issue commercial driver's licenses and other things. That does not give us confidence in the integrity of the system today.

We need enhanced criminal penalties in place for anyone involved in any aspect of the fake driver's license trade, and also we need to establish whistleblower protections to get people to come forward with information.

We should also require States to implement effective auditing programs in order to scrutinize every aspect of the issuing process for driver's licenses. One way to cut down on internal fraud and abuse is to protect the integrity of the agency's process. So a State should be able to find out for example, through routine audits, if some of their equipment used to manufacture driver's licenses are missing or inventory is

unusually low for the number of applications received.

Frankly, these things would move us toward a system which would give more credence to the current process of presenting identification. I don't mind standing in line at airports. Last week, I was at Chicago Midway, and I twice stood in lines for a half hour each to present my identification and plane ticket. That is part of the cost of making certain that when I got on that airplane, it was safe. I think people all across America understand that. It is sad, and I wish it weren't the case, but it would be sadder still if the wrong person using fake documents got on the plane and ended up endangering many innocent lives. But if this process is worth anything, and if it is going to work, the identification presented has to be valid and validated. That is why this effort is so important.

I have discussed this in terms of terrorism and security, but two other aspects should be mentioned. All across America now, we have problems with drunk driving. Fortunately, the percentage of drunk drivers has gone down dramatically in this country, and I give credit to effective law enforcement, as well as to organizations such as Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD) and Students Against Drunk Driving (SADD). They have changed the climate and environment, advocating designated drivers and a more responsible use of alcohol. Even some of the beer and alcoholic beverage companies have gone that extra step to try to advertise the dangers of drinking and driving, and the need to be suspicious of those who do.

The biggest problem we face here is the number of young people under 21 who are easily able to obtain phony driver's licenses and identifications who can then purchase alcohol. Once they purchase and consume it and end up in an intoxicated state, they endanger their lives and others. If we toughen the standards by which States issue these driver's licenses, and if we go after the manufacturers and marketers of fake documents with heavy penalties, and if we make the cards more resistant to counterfeiting, then I believe we can diminish the likelihood that a young person will end up with a phony license or identification, buy alcohol, and cause a death in the process.

The next area I will mention is one that I know personally—identity theft. You may not be aware of the fact that this is the largest growing consumer fraud complaint in America. Last year, at the Federal Trade Commission, 204,000 complaints were filed for a variety of deceptive practices, and 42 percent of them related to identity theft. This means that in just one year, close to 100,000 Americans were victimized when somebody took their name and their information and did something with it without their approval. It has happened to me as a Member of the Senate. I got a call a couple of years ago at home, and they said:

We finally caught up with you, Richard Durbin. Did you think you were going to avoid this bill you incurred in Denver, Colorado?

I said:

I haven't incurred any bills in Denver, Colorado."

They said:

Yes, you did. You applied for a credit card, and here is your Social Security number. You made several thousand dollars in purchases and you never paid for it.

I said:

It never happened. I never went to that store. I haven't been in Denver, Colorado, for that purpose.

Someone had stolen my identity, and they applied for a local credit card, and they ran up several thousand dollars in purchases. Of course, they didn't make any payments. Eventually, I straightened it out. There are ways to do that although it could take a long time. I give credit to the credit agencies that accepted the truthful information and cleared my credit record.

Identity theft is growing, and part of the scam is to come up with phony documentation. One of the key elements in documentation is your driver's license which is the most widely used form of identification. Once you have that license, doors start to open. You use that phony license to match the name on a stolen credit card, and you are off to the races. It is pretty easy. Sadly, we have to acknowledge that it is a growing problem in America.

So coming up with minimum uniform standards on driver's licenses, making sure that when they are issued, they are truly issued to the person who is applying for them, providing ways to make certain that other States haven't revoked a driver's license when a new State is being asked to issue one, making certain that States improve their internal processes to prevent fraud and abuse, putting in tougher penalties for those who would abuse them, incorporating security features on driver's licenses so they can't be counterfeited—all of these things move us forward to improve our nation's security.

And all of these common sense solutions add up to a process that is far from anything remotely resembling any national identification card. There would not be any new nationally issued cards or databases or tracking systems or collection of sensitive information. There would not be intrusion on privacy—if the FBI needed information about a potential criminal's information contained in his DMV record, they would go through the same process they do today—by going to each State and following the established process to obtain that information.

What I propose is a system where the States would have an incentive to move forward—a better system, more accurate, with more integrity, with ability to work more effectively with other States. I think this is a step in the right direction. I commend my colleagues who have expressed an interest in this issue. In the next several weeks,

we will have a hearing in the Governmental Affairs Committee, where we will bring in people from across the spectrum—law enforcement, State leaders and representatives, those who have been deceived, and those who have had their identity stolen from them.

I will ask them to come together to help us with legislation that will take this commonsense step forward, to make sure that the most commonly used photo identification presented at an airport or a train station or at the bank is really is an indication of true identity of the cardholder.

I yield back my time, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, there are discussions underway regarding the impasse we continue to experience on the voter identification amendment and other related issues on the election reform bill. I am probably stating the obvious—but I will make it official—there are no more rollcall votes today. My expectation is the next rollcall vote will be on Monday evening after 6 o'clock. We will set a specific time a little later, but there will be at least a cloture vote on the bill Monday morning, if we have not been able to arrive at any other agreement prior to that time.

Members should be aware they should expect a vote on Monday night, and then certainly Tuesday morning.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:10 p.m., recessed until 1:19 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BAYH).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak in morning business for about 12 minutes.

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

ENERGY LEGISLATION AND IRAQ

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, this being the first day of March, I remind my colleagues of the schedule before us. We are about 3 weeks away from our 2-week Easter recess. There are many items on the agenda: campaign finance reform; trade authority; stimulus, perhaps; and, of course, the President's budget, which will take, I am sure, at least a week.

So it is becoming somewhat clear that time is a precious commodity. It is in short supply. I remind my colleagues of commitments made by the majority leader. These were commitments made in good faith about time and about energy, and we have both around this body.

I am reminded of a statement he made on November 27 of last year. I quote:

I am prepaid to commit to taking up the energy bill prior to the Founders Day recess; that is, during the first work period, between January 22 and the time we break for the Founders Day recess.

Again, on December 3, the majority leader said:

I have already stated very emphatically my desire to bring up the energy bill prior to the Founders Day recess, to have a good debate, to talk about all of the issues, including those which are controversial. It is my expectation we will do just that.

Again, that was December.

The majority leader says he wants to move an energy bill, but I am afraid we just have not seen the kind of commitment that America expects or that is referenced in our calendar. We spent virtually all day yesterday in quorum calls, morning business, with no votes. We certainly have not done an awful lot this week. I note it is Friday afternoon, and it is pretty lonesome around here. Nevertheless, I do want to bring to everyone's attention the absence of any aggressive timeframe in addressing this energy legislation.

As you know, it was one of our President's priorities. The priorities were energy, a stimulus package, and trade promotion.

To my knowledge, after looking through the RECORD, our debates, so far, have been quite limited. I spoke an hour on it. Senator DASCHLE spoke for some 20 minutes. That was some time ago. I do not think that is an energy debate.

In my view, the leader has been waiting I do not know for what purpose. When will it come up? Perhaps Monday or Tuesday. It probably will not come up Monday; maybe Tuesday. The longer it takes until we can pass an energy bill, the longer our Nation remains vulnerable.

In my opinion, energy dependence is our Achilles' heel. Our enemies are painfully aware of this. We waited too long to deal with bin Laden, we waited too long to deal with al-Qaida, and we are waiting too long to deal with Saddam Hussein.

This is a new month. There is still time and there are still plenty of op-

portunities to commit to the debate and the vote. But the longer we wait to address our energy security, the tougher it becomes to fix and the greater the risks that we face.

Mr. President, I would also like to call to the attention of my colleagues the dilemma we will face once we get to the bill. This is a very complex bill. It is inferior, in my opinion, because it did not come through the normal course of activities associated with Senate procedure.

Ordinarily, the bill would begin, upon introduction, by being referred to the committee of jurisdiction, the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. The committee would hold hearings. It would take witnesses. It would develop a consensus, and, more importantly, it would provide an education for each member on the intricacies.

We are going to be talking about ANWR. That is a very contentious issue. But equally contentious is going to be CAFE standards. Just what are we going to do to address conservation? And, indeed, at what price?

The electric portion is extraordinarily complicated. We have not had an opportunity for review in the normal process. As a consequence, Members are going to be educated by lobbyists, lobbyists with special interests. I venture to say, three-quarters, if not more, of the membership is not familiar with the terminology used in the electric bill. It is very, very complex.

Our interests, of course, are maintaining an uninterrupted supply of electric energy in this country. We have seen what happened in California. We are going to need more transmission lines, more intra- and interstate activities relative to oversight by FERC. I could go on and on, but I promised to keep my remarks within 12 minutes.

My purpose in bringing this issue up is to make sure every Member understands what we are looking at. We are going to be looking at a bill that has been laid down as the energy bill, without the process of the hearings, without the process of committee action, without the process of Republicans and Democrats having come together on some kind of a consensus about what we could agree or disagree on. That is going to be done on the floor of the Senate, which I think is unfortunate. And I am very critical, very frankly, of the Democratic leader, who made the decision to pull the responsibility away.

We all know why that was done. It was done strictly as a political move, to ensure the issue of ANWR did not come up in the committee, because the votes to pass out a bill with ANWR were clearly within the committee's structure. We had both Democratic and Republican support. As a consequence of this decision, we are left with this rather unusual set of circumstances.

I might say, to some extent, it was also done to the Commerce Committee, which was debating the issue of CAFE

standards. It couldn't address it or resolve it. At least they had the authority up to that time. But, anyway, that was pulled from their committee as well from the standpoint of jurisdiction.

So, my point is, we have a process here that is less than traditional. I think it is less than a bipartisan effort in the Senate to try to move a bill.

So the bill has been laid down on the floor by the majority leader, and we will start the process.

As a consequence of that, I think it is also important to recognize the realities.

Yesterday, our brave men and women in uniform were again fired upon. They were fired upon by Saddam Hussein's ground forces. They were threatened. They were attacked. As a consequence, they fired back.

I am not talking about Afghanistan; I am talking about Iraq, a country from which we are currently importing 800,000 barrels of oil a day.

I quote the Associated Press:

U.S. planes patrolling a no-fly zone over northern Iraq bombed an Iraqi air defense system Thursday in response to Iraqi anti-aircraft fire, the U.S. military said. It is the second time that U.S. planes have bombed Iraqi defense sites in northern Iraq this year.

Well, we are 2 months into this year.

But since the gulf war, in 1992, we have been enforcing a no-fly zone over Iraq to keep Saddam Hussein in check. A no-fly zone is almost an aerial blockade in the sense of comparing it to a sea blockade. It is considered almost an act of war.

It is the second time we have bombed, as I said, and it is only March 1st. So I think we are off to a rather troubling start.

Last year, Iraq shot at U.S. forces, enforcing the no-fly zone, over 400 times. We responded on 23 occasions.

But let's not lose sight that while, on the one hand, we perhaps make a fist at Iraq, on the other hand, we have our hand out taking his oil.

In September 2001, we broke an 11-year-old record, importing more than 1.16 million barrels of oil from Iraq. It was the same time that we had the aircraft used as a weapon in taking down the Twin Towers in New York and the Pentagon and the tragedy that occurred in Pennsylvania. It was the same time.

Where is the synergy? We have given Saddam Hussein more than \$4 billion for his oil in the last year. That is a lot of money for an economy that is believed to have a GDP of only about \$52 billion.

What does he do with that money? We know he has chemical weapons. He has a chemical weapons program. The reason we know it is because during the Iran-Iraqi war he used it on his own people—his own people—the Kurdish people in northern Iraq.

In fact, he is believed to have sufficient chemicals to produce hundreds of tons of mustard gas, VX, and other nerve agents, as well as 25 missiles and

an estimated 15,000 artillery shells capable of the delivery of lethal weapons.

Israel witnessed first hand the reach of his weapons delivery system during the gulf war. We know what happened. We know of missiles that were aimed at Israel. We know he has been working on nuclear weapons because one of his top nuclear engineers defected to the West in 1994 and has given us details of the program.

Over many years, Iraq has worked on a number of occasions to acquire the material and the knowledge to perhaps build some kind of crude nuclear weapon. We can only truly speculate on the extent of his success, but it is commonly believed that an Iraqi nuclear device is inevitable. And if it is not available currently, the question is when?

I think it is fair to say that he is up to no good. We can't say for sure because we haven't had U.N. inspectors in there since 1998. There was a U.N. mandate that we do that. We have not followed through. One can only imagine what he might be able to have accomplished in almost 4 years of seclusion.

As long as we are dependent on sources such as Saddam Hussein for our oil, we will continue to finance the regime of Saddam Hussein. As long as he is in power, he will continue to threaten the world as a member of the axis of evil, which is a quote from our President.

All the tools he needs evidently are now within his grasp. Reducing foreign dependence on oil can reduce the influence and the reach of a Saddam Hussein. The question we have to ask ourselves is, when and if we are going to have to deal with this, what will be the consequences if we wait too long? Will it be another terrorist attack sponsored by Iraq? Will it be another situation where we have something occur that we wish we had taken care of because all the signs were there that this threat was real? Reducing our dependence on a country such as Iraq is going to decrease the supply of oil, so the price is going to go up.

So what do we do? We have domestic opportunities, and some of that will come up in the debate on ANWR, which obviously, as the occupant of the Chair knows, is a conviction I have, that we can open it safely, that it will come on line in roughly 2½ to 3 years, that it would be on line now if President Clinton had not vetoed it in 1995, and that it is a significant supply because it is estimated at somewhere between 6.5 and 16 billion barrels. If it is half that, it would be as big as Prudhoe Bay.

I might add, for the benefit of the Chair, who is not from Texas, I can speculate that there is much more oil in ANWR than in all of Texas.

With that profound statement, I ask unanimous consent that a Washington Post article of Friday, March 1, final edition, be printed in the RECORD, that portion covering Thursday's bombing which comes amid a rising debate on whether Iraq will be the next target of

U.S. antiterrorism campaigns. President George Bush "branded Iraq as part of an 'axis of evil' along with Iran and North Korea, and accused it of seeking weapons of mass destruction."

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

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 1, 2002]

JETS ON PATROL OVER IRAQ ATTACK AIR DEFENSE SITES

ANKARA (AP).—U.S. planes patrolling a no-fly zone over northern Iraq bombed an Iraqi air defense system Thursday in response to Iraqi anti-aircraft fire, the U.S. military said.

It is the second time that U.S. planes have bombed Iraqi defense sites in northern Iraq this year. The planes dropped bombs on the Iraqi defense system after Iraqi forces north of Mosul fired on them during routine patrols of the zone, the U.S. European Command said on a statement. Mosul is 400 kilometers (250 miles) north of Baghdad.

The planes returned safely to their base at Incirlik, in southern Turkey, the command, which is based in Germany, said.

U.S. and U.K. planes based in southeast Turkey have been flying patrols over northern Iraq since 1991 to protect the Kurdish population from Iraqi forces. Iraq doesn't recognize the zone and has been challenging allied aircraft regularly since 1998.

Thursday's bombing comes amid a rising debate on whether Iraq will be the next target of the U.S. anti-terror campaign. U.S. President George W. Bush branded Iraq as part of an "axis of evil" along with Iran and North Korea, and accused it of seeking weapons of mass destruction.

Turkey, host to the air patrols and a launching pad for strikes against Iraq in the 1991 Gulf War, fears that a war in Iraq could lead to creation of a Kurdish state and boost aspirations of autonomy-seeking Kurds in Turkey.

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

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Senator from Alaska, Mr. MURKOWSKI, has come to the floor on several occasions and complained about the manner and method in which Senator BINGAMAN and Senator DASCHLE brought forth the energy bill, which will shortly come before the Senate. They have complained about the path by which it got to the floor. My friend, the Senator from Alaska, says it should have been reported out of the Energy Committee rather than coming to the floor by Senate standing rule XIV.

But, in May of 2000, Senator LOTT moved a Republican bill—the National Energy Security Act of 2000—to the floor by rule XIV.

So when the Senator from Alaska was chair of the Energy Committee and the Republicans were in the majority, they moved the bill to the floor exactly the same way Senator DASCHLE has moved our bill. So the ranking member

of the Energy Committee is now complaining of Senator DASCHLE doing exactly the same thing they did. He participated in this when he was chairman of the committee.

It seems the Senator from Alaska is denigrating the example he set last Congress. I guess in the minds of the minority, turnabout is not fair play. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EQUAL PROTECTION OF VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 2001

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I would like to clarify some issues related to my amendment that passed the Senate earlier this week regarding the establishment of a protection and advocacy system to ensure that people with disabilities have full and equal access to the election process. Among other provisions, my amendment states that protection and advocacy systems under S. 565 may not resort to litigation when representing persons with disabilities who have been denied equal access to the polling place or to the voting process.

I agreed to this provision with some trepidation, since the protection and advocacy system has a long and well established authority under several federal laws to pursue litigation to enforce the rights of people with disabilities. The protection and advocacy system has proven themselves to be responsible stewards of the public trust we as members of Congress have placed in them in regard to litigation. The protection and advocacy system is known for exhausting all other remedies before resorting to litigation, and in fact less than 5 percent of all cases handled by protection and advocacy systems nationally result in litigation. The vast majority of people with disabilities helped by the protection and advocacy system have their issues resolved through alternative means of dispute resolution such as negotiation and mediation.

And yet the authority to pursue litigation when necessary and when warranted is an essential component of our nation's disability rights system. If we take away the ability of people with disabilities to obtain due process through the courts, we take away the level playing field created by laws such as the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Fair Housing Act, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the Rehabilitation Act, the Developmental Disabilities Act, and others. Because of that, it is essential that protection and advocacy systems retain their current authority to utilize a full array of approaches, including litigation, to carry

out their important work as defenders of the rights of people with disabilities. Nothing in my amendment today is intended to undermine that important authority in any other federal laws affecting the protection and advocacy system.

I look forward to continuing in my role as a champion of the protection and advocacy system, and of the rights of people with disabilities.

FIGHTING HATE VIOLENCE

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I rise today to pay homage to the legion of African-American leaders who have made extraordinary contributions to humanity by fighting to secure equality and justice for us all. As a consequence of their valiant efforts, people of color can now enjoy a quality of life, including unprecedented educational and professional opportunities, never before realized. Because of their courage, we all can experience the benefits that flow from building a nation that values the creativity and talent of all her citizens. I am, and we all should be, proud to be the beneficiaries of their heroic acts.

Despite the extraordinary accomplishments of the past century, however, we began this new millennium still burdened by the weight of racial prejudice and the hatred, and sometimes violence, that emanates from it. Based on improved data collection efforts, we now know that far too frequently individuals may be victimized or otherwise targeted for vicious acts, simply because of the color of their skin, or the content of their faith, or because of any number of distinguishing characteristics—differences that should form the basis of our best American values, but instead are used to injure certain individuals and tarnish the American spirit.

Simply stated, hate violence is a scourge on our national consciousness, and the incidents of it are embarrassingly high. Perhaps the best-known racially-motivated hate crime in recent years is the callous killing of James Byrd, who, for no other reason except the color of his skin, was chained to the back of a pickup truck and dragged to his death. Mr. Byrd's death was senseless and shocking, but by no means is it the only example of such a crime. Each year, thousands of Americans are subjected to hate crimes, in perhaps not so savage a manner as Mr. Byrd's murder, but no less cruel and no less harmful.

Consider these numbers: while the overall number of crimes reported to the Federal Bureau of Investigation in 2000 declined slightly, by 0.2 percent, reported hate crimes increased 2.3 percent, from 7,876 in 1999 to 8,063. And by all indicators, those numbers likely underestimate the true magnitude of hate violence in our country. Studies by organizations like the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives have revealed that countless tar-

gets of hate violence, some of whom are immigrants who fear reprisals or deportation, decline to report these crimes to the police.

As disturbing as the quantity of hate crimes committed each year, however, is the record number of young people who are perpetrating these crimes. According to a special report by the Federal Bureau of Justice Statistics, from 1997 to 1999, 33 percent of all known hate crime offenders were under the age of 18 years. For that same time period, another 29 percent of all hate crime offenders were 18 to 24 years of age. In total, an alarming 62 percent of all offenders were under the age of 24. When they should be imagining their college years or their early career plans, some kids, sometimes suffering under great mental depression, are instead conjuring up awful acts of hatred.

The damage caused by these crimes cannot be measured solely in terms of the physical injury inflicted or the property costs incurred. The devastation they provoke is far greater and much more destructive. These crimes fragment our society and inspire distrust. They fuel fear and suspicion of groups and communities that are unfamiliar. And, perhaps most fatal, they threaten to stall the important growth and community-building that must transpire for this Nation to retain its standing as a world leader for centuries to come.

If we have learned anything from the tragic events of September 11, it is that we cannot tolerate acts of hatred. We must enable a swift and tough law enforcement response by refining Federal hate crime laws, as well as give our children the tools to confront violent bigotry by providing necessary education and programming.

We can undertake to do nothing more important, nor pay any greater tribute to the heroes we honor during Black History Month, than to fight hate violence in every form and in every way we know. The security and safety of all Americans depend on it.

TRIBUTE TO DAN NAATZ

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I rise today to say goodbye to a good friend of mine, someone who has worked by my side for the last 13 years.

Dan Naatz has been my chief of staff for the last 2 years, but his commitment to me and Wyoming has lasted much longer than that.

I first met Dan back in 1989 when he joined my office in the U.S. House of Representatives. He was one of the first staff members I hired after being elected that year in a special election to fill the seat left open by DICK CHENEY who was nominated to be our Secretary of Defense.

After several years, Dan made the decision to return to school and earn a master's degree from the University of Virginia.

I was disappointed to see him go then, but after he earned that degree I

was fortunate enough to convince him to come back and serve as my legislative director.

Dan was with me when I was honored to win a seat in the U.S. Senate in 1994 as well. Our history together goes way back.

It is never easy to lose someone like Dan, who has been with me since the beginning. He has held nearly every position in my office and did them all very well. None better than the job he did of leading my staff and our legislative agenda for Wyoming.

It was inevitable though that Dan would be recognized outside of this body though for his expertise in crafting successful legislation and public policy.

Over the years, he has been a key advisor and good friend.

Particularly, Dan played a significant role in our efforts to reform and strengthen the National Park System.

As Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on National Parks, he and I spent many hours together, first writing and developing changes that would improve the system for visitors and the valuable resources, and then, as the engine that helped see it through to public law.

I was proud of all the work he did, and he should be proud of the changes he helped make, because they will make a difference for future generations who will visit and experience our parks.

Dan has joined CHEP USA. I wish him and his wife Cindy and their family the best of luck, and I know the Senate body does as well.

PROSECUTING GUN-RELATED CRIMES

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, the fight to reduce gun violence must be waged on two fronts. First, we need to keep guns out of the hands of criminals, prevent children from gaining access to firearms and give law enforcement the resources they need to thoroughly investigate gun-related crimes. At the same time, we have to vigorously prosecute criminals who commit gun-related crimes.

According to the 2000 National Crime Victimization Survey, 533,470 victims of rape and sexual assault, robbery and aggravated assault faced a perpetrator with a firearm. The Community Gun Violence Prosecution Program can play a major role in improving prosecution of criminals who commit these gun-related violent crimes by providing funding to hire prosecutors solely to prosecute firearm-related violent crimes. Providing funds to improve prosecution will not only bring felons to justice, but will also act as a deterrent to future crimes.

On Monday, it was announced that the Dickinson County, MI, prosecutors office will receive \$119,117 from the U.S. Department of Justice through CGVPP. The grant will be used to hire an assistant prosecutor who will devote

his or her time to prosecuting violent crimes committed with a firearm. This grant is the latest of several that prosecutors in Michigan, including Wayne, Muskegon and Ingham County prosecutors, have received to combat and deter gun-related crime. The efforts of prosecutors are critical to getting violent criminals off the streets. However we cannot forget that preventing gun violence ultimately requires that we enact sensible gun-safety legislation.

RECOGNIZING STEWART VERDERY

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize C. Stewart Verdery, General Counsel to the Assistant Republican Leader, DON NICKLES, and a staffer for the Senate Republican High Tech Task Force, of which I serve as Chair, for his dedicated service to the Senate.

After more than 6 years of serving the U.S. Senate, Stewart Verdery will depart today to join the team at Vivendi Universal here in Washington, D.C. He first served as counsel to my friend from Virginia, Senator JOHN WARNER. Stewart then served as counsel to the Senate Rules Committee, as counsel to the Senate Judiciary Committee, and currently serves as General Counsel to Senator DON NICKLES. Let me take this opportunity to also thank Senator NICKLES for allowing Stewart to dedicate time to the High Tech Task Force and the broader goal of advancing constructive technology policy in the Senate.

As Chairman of the High Tech Task Force, I have come to know Stewart very well over the last year through his role as an advisor to Task Force and to the Republican leadership on technology issues. From the beginning, I have been impressed by his extraordinary command of complex technology issues and, perhaps more important, his ability to succinctly explain the issues to others. His advice and counsel were always sound and thoughtful, and through his effective and friendly manner, he instantly earned the respect of those with whom he worked.

Stewart Verdery played a key role in the transformation of the High Tech Task Force into a lead advocate for the technology-friendly policies in the Senate. With his assistance, my colleagues and I were better prepared to advance a positive technology policy agenda in the Senate last year, including: the passage of a clean, two-year Internet tax moratorium extension; passage of the upgraded Export Administration Act reauthorization; securing additional funding for anti-piracy prosecutions; and the hard-fought effort in the economic stimulus debate to make the Research and Development tax credit permanent, to provide enhanced expensing and to include the broadband tax credit.

I speak for many in the U.S. Senate when I say that we will miss Stewart and his talents. I wish Stewart, his

wife Jenny and their two young children, Isabelle and Chase, all the very best health and happiness in their future endeavors.

CAPITOL POLICE CHIEF JAMES VAREY

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, for the past 17 years, James Varey has served this institution with distinction, and I want to congratulate him and wish him the best in his retirement.

As the Capitol Chief of Police since May 2000, he has been the best of the best at one of the most difficult times in our history. The Capitol Police has never had to respond to the terrible problems we have seen in the last 6 months, be it terrorist threats, or anthrax attacks, but because of the strong leadership at the top, this institution has remained strong and open to the public. The force will miss Chief Varey's great advocacy on their behalf, which resulted in such new resources as the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center. We will certainly miss the friendly spirit he has displayed to the entire Senate family. Most of all, the institution will miss his dedication and hard work.

CELEBRATING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mrs. CARNAHAN. Mr. President, when I think of women who have put their stamp on history, I think of so many "Wonder Women" from Lucretia Mott to Eleanor Roosevelt to Sally Ride. While these names are recognizable to all of us, there are others—teachers, mothers, grandmothers—who are unsung heroines. They are women who greatly influenced our lives.

I have also come to admire our 19th-century counterparts—the women who were warriors on the front lines of the slavery, suffrage, and temperance battles. These early advocates of social justice continue to inspire us today. With few resources at their command, they were forced to use the power of ideas to affect change. The pen became a mighty sword; the voice, a thunderous cannon. They shook the 19th century.

Two of these women were contemporaries. They were both reared in New England, were married, had large families and overwhelming personal responsibilities. They were especially sensitive to injustice. Both changed the thinking of the nation on the dominant issues of their day. Beyond that, the similarities cease. One was from a prominent family, the daughter of a renowned clergyman. Unlike most women of her time, she was well-educated—a teacher and a writer. The other woman was a slave, unable to read or write. But she could speak, and did that quite well.

One was Harriet Beecher Stowe, the author of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*—the woman whose writings did more to

arouse the conscience of the nation against slavery than anyone of her day. Harriet had seven children and a husband who was a hypochondriac. He took to his bed whenever there was a crisis in life, leaving her to manage on her own. In spite of the demands on her, Harriet managed to do what she loved most—to write. At the time, women with political opinions were not taken seriously, but that did not prevent her from expressing her ideas. She somehow found time to write—letters, articles, entire books—thirty-three literary works in all. *Uncle Tom's Cabin* broke all sales records of its day. Her success brought her to the attention of the President of the United States. It is said that Abraham Lincoln referred to her as "the little lady whose book started this big war."

Harriet recognized what women have known for centuries, that there are duties, intrusions, necessary things that lay claim to our time and thoughts. That was certainly true of Isabella Baumfree, the hearty slave woman who faced more than her share of adversity. She was quite a contrast to the very proper, primly dressed, and precisely spoken Mrs. Stowe.

By 1828, New York had abolished slavery. Around the same time, Isabella felt the call to preach. She was 46. She took the name Sojourner Truth because it was her intention to sojourn the land and proclaim the truth. Since she couldn't read the Bible, Isabella had it read to her, and she memorized large portions of it. She dictated her life's story and sold it to support herself. Wherever she spoke, her simple but dynamic message attracted crowds. She confounded the skeptics with plain truth and images from her own life, but critics hounded her. When told that there were threats to burn the auditorium where she was to speak, Sojourner replied, "Let them burn the building and I will speak upon the ashes."

Women of accomplishment have always been adaptive. They find a way when there is no way. They wear many hats. Being generalists, they come at problems from many different perspectives.

A good example of this can be seen in the life of a St. Louis lady by the name of Frances Gage, or Aunt Fanny as she was known in the women's movement. Aunt Fanny loved to give speeches at the women's conventions. She often told her audiences about an incident that had inspired her to become an activist on behalf of women. "At age ten, I made my first barrel. It was a beautiful barrel. The cooper who instructed me told my father, 'Fanny made that barrel and has done it quicker and better than any boy I have had after six months training.'" Fanny beamed with pride as she waited for her father's approval. Instead he shook his head and replied, "What a pity that you were not born a boy so that you could be good for something. Now, run into the house, child, and go back to your knitting."

Having been rejected as a barrel maker, Fanny turned her energy to being a speechmaker for the women's movement. Her desire to make a perfect barrel transferred to a desire to perfect the rights of women. Not only are women adaptive, they are triumphant. Without the traditional power resources—money, position, and prestige they had to rely on their talents and determination.

These women refused to see themselves as too weak, or under-empowered, to make a difference. Their efforts on the critical issues of their time radically changed the course of the nation. They were not just taking political stands—not just writing and speaking about compassion, justice, and mercy. They were engaged in daily acts of human kindness. What they said and what they did matched. These women left their stamp on history with their ability to be adaptive, triumphant, and genuine. They have also left their stamp on us, their 20th- and 21st-century sisters. For these traits are alive and well in women today.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENT

CONGRATULATING THE MEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN IN MADISON

• Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, today, as a proud alumnus, I congratulate the Men's basketball team at the University of Wisconsin in Madison for their victory over the University of Michigan this week. This victory allowed UW's Coach Bo Ryan and his Badgers to claim the Big Ten conference title for the first time since 1947. As a fellow Badger, I am proud of their accomplishment and I look forward to their play in the post season.

This marks the 104th season since the UW-Madison men's basketball program began. From their first season in 1898 to their Cinderella season two years ago, to this week, when they clinched the title, Badger Basketball has more than earned this Big Ten Championship. The people of Wisconsin continue to support and cheer for our Badgers each season. Known as one of the finest institutions of public higher education, UW-Madison also has proven to be a powerhouse in Big Ten sports.

I take great pride in commending our men's basketball team. As a graduate of UW-Madison, I wish Coach Ryan and his Badger team all the best in the upcoming post season. Wisconsin is behind you, and we wish you all the luck. Go Badgers!

TRIBUTE TO JARAD ROBERT LYONS

• Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, today I want to recognize and congratulate a special Coloradan, Jarad Robert Lyons, for winning the AAA State Wrestling Championship Title in his division.

Jarad, an 18-year-old senior at Ignacio High School, started wrestling

at the very early age of 4 in the Pee Wee divisions. He continued his career throughout junior high and high school, and first qualified for the State championships in his junior year in the 136-pound division. He has received numerous awards leading up to this year's State championship, where he qualified in the 145-pound division. He placed first at the Regionals—Southern Region, Tournament in Salida, CO. He then took first place at the Ignacio Invitational, first again at the Moab Tournament and first at the Rocky Mountain Invitational, where he was also awarded the Most Valuable Wrestler Award.

Jarad was one of his team's captains this year, and his senior season is a true list of accomplishment. In the last two months alone, he has been named Outstanding Middle Weight Wrestler at the Aztec Duels, Champion at the Rocky Mountain Invitational, Champion at the Moab Tournament, Champion and Outstanding Wrestler at the Ignacio Invitational, League Champion at the Intermountain League, Champion at the Regional Tournament, and then finally, State Champion at the CO State Championship tournament for the AAA division which was held the weekend of February 21-23.

Jarad Lyons, is without a doubt, a class act. He is respected by not only his teammates and his coach, but by other coaches in the State as well. He is a compassionate team member, and is willing to help every wrestler on his team, regardless of his experience. He is well known throughout his community, and enjoys the support and well wishes of everyone. People feel they can call him at home, and tell him how proud they are of him. I think this is the mark of a truly special young man.

In his free time, while I know wrestling takes precedence, Jarad also enjoys working on his car, a 1965 Barracuda, which he purchased himself and has rebuilt entirely. He now drives the silver and black pinstriped classic beauty very proudly.

I congratulate Jarad Lyons on his tremendous achievement, and wish him every success in the future. He is an example of the success that hard work and determination bring when we set ourselves to achieving our goals. He is an outstanding young Coloradan and he has earned and deserves our applause and congratulations.

HONORING DANIEL MAYDAN ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE'S TORCH OF LIBERTY AWARD

• Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I would like to set aside a moment to reflect on the work of Dr. Daniel Maydan, the latest recipient of the Anti-Defamation League's Torch of Liberty Award. This distinguished honor recognizes those who personify the League's ideals of equality and justice.

Dr. Maydan, President of California-based Applied Materials, is a true leader in the technology industry and broader community. He spearheaded the development of the company's plas-

ma etch technologies, leading to the creation of a manufacturing system central to California's semiconductor industry. This revolutionary technology has been included in the Smithsonian Institution's breakthrough technologies collection.

Bridging the digital divide both at home and abroad, Dr. Maydan helped strengthen Israel's presence in the global economic sphere, earning the Israel Trade and State of Israel Jubilee Awards. In addition, he established scholarship programs at Hebrew University and a Center for Advanced Materials Study at the Israel Institute of Technology to encourage and support others pursuing studies and careers in the sciences. In addition to his many other activities, he serves on the Board of Directors of the San Jose Symphony.

Dr. Maydan has helped shape our technology field and helped make it possible for others to follow his lead. It is clear that he is most worthy of this honor.

TRIBUTE TO KENTUCKY'S COMMUNITIES

• Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, today I rise to congratulate 10 Kentucky communities for being named to "Site Selection" magazine's top 100 Small Towns. "Site Selection," an Atlanta-based magazine circulated to over 45,000 executives involved in corporate site selection decisions, based its study on how well prepared small towns are to handle businesses searching for new project locations and business ventures. Specifically, each town was judged by the total number of jobs created, the number created on a per capita basis, unemployment rates, and the amount of investments by companies who locate in the community.

The 10 towns in Kentucky named to this noteworthy list are: Bowling Green, Campbellsville, Danville, Bardstown, Frankfort, Elizabethtown, Franklin, Shelbyville, Glasgow, Madisonville, and Lebanon. Through their hard work and commitment to progress, these towns have proven to the business community nationwide that they are more than prepared to take on the many challenges that accompany the opening of new business projects. I take this as an indication of the Commonwealth's commitment to creating a new and better economy for future generations of Kentuckians.

I once again congratulate these 10 communities for this much deserved distinction and thank the men and women living in these towns for continually working toward the greater good of the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted.

By Mr. BAUCUS, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

S. 1979: A bill to provide energy tax incentives. (Rept. No. 107-140).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LEAHY for the Committee on the Judiciary:

William Smith Taylor, of Alabama, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of Alabama for the term of four years.

By Mr. BINGAMAN for the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

*Raymond L. Orbach, of California, to be Director of the Office of Science, Department of Energy.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

NOMINATION DISCHARGED

The following nomination was discharged from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions pursuant to the order of March 1, 2002:

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

Leslie Silverman, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for the remainder of the term expiring July 1, 2003.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

S. 1978. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to promote the provision of retirement investment advice to workers managing their retirement income assets; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BAUCUS:

S. 1979. A bill to provide energy tax incentives; from the Committee on Finance; placed on the calendar.

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 1980. A bill to require a training program for all airline personnel responsible for

checking passenger identification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 1981. A bill to enhance penalties for fraud in connection with identification documents that facilitates an act of domestic terrorism; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 653

At the request of Mr. BAYH, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 653, a bill to amend part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to provide grants to States to encourage media campaigns to promote responsible fatherhood skills, and for other purposes.

S. 999

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. CAMPBELL) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 999, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for a Korea Defense Service Medal to be issued to members of the Armed Forces who participated in operations in Korea after the end of the Korean War.

S. 1476

At the request of Mr. CLELAND, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1476, a bill to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Reverend Doctor Martin Luther King, Jr. (posthumously) and his widow Coretta Scott King in recognition of their contributions to the Nation on behalf of the civil rights movement.

S. 1677

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1677, a bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to create a safe harbor for retirement plan sponsors in the designation and monitoring of investment advisers for workers managing their retirement income assets.

S. RES. 185

At the request of Mr. ALLEN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 185, a resolution recognizing the historical significance of the 100th anniversary of Korean immigration to the United States.

S. RES. 207

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ALLEN), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Flor-

ida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH), the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE), and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 207, a resolution designating March 31, 2002, and March 31, 2003, as "National Civilian Conservation Corps Day."

S. RES. 209

At the request of Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 209, a resolution to express the sense of the Senate regarding prenatal care for women and children.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

S. 1978. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to promote the provision of retirement investment advice to workers managing their retirement income assets; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1978

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Retirement Security Advice Act of 2002".

SEC. 2. PROHIBITED TRANSACTION EXEMPTION FOR THE PROVISION OF INVESTMENT ADVICE.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO THE EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974.—

(1) EXEMPTION FROM PROHIBITED TRANSACTIONS.—Section 408(b) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1108(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(14)(A) Any transaction described in subparagraph (B) in connection with the provision of investment advice described in section 3(21)(A)(ii), in any case in which—

"(i) the investment of assets of the plan is subject to the direction of plan participants or beneficiaries,

"(ii) the advice is provided to the plan or a participant or beneficiary of the plan by a fiduciary adviser in connection with any sale, acquisition, or holding of a security or other property for purposes of investment of plan assets, and

"(iii) the requirements of subsection (g) are met in connection with the provision of the advice.

"(B) The transactions described in this subparagraph are the following:

"(i) the provision of the advice to the plan, participant, or beneficiary;

"(ii) the sale, acquisition, or holding of a security or other property (including any lending of money or other extension of credit associated with the sale, acquisition, or holding of a security or other property) pursuant to the advice; and

"(iii) the direct or indirect receipt of fees or other compensation by the fiduciary adviser or an affiliate thereof (or any employee, agent, or registered representative of

the fiduciary adviser or affiliate) in connection with the provision of the advice or in connection with a sale, acquisition, or holding of a security or other property pursuant to the advice.”.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—Section 408 of such Act is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g) REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO PROVISION OF INVESTMENT ADVICE BY FIDUCIARY ADVISERS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The requirements of this subsection are met in connection with the provision of investment advice referred to in section 3(21)(A)(ii), provided to an employee benefit plan or a participant or beneficiary of an employee benefit plan by a fiduciary adviser with respect to the plan in connection with any sale, acquisition, or holding of a security or other property for purposes of investment of amounts held by the plan, if—

“(A) in the case of the initial provision of the advice with regard to the security or other property by the fiduciary adviser to the plan, participant, or beneficiary, the fiduciary adviser provides to the recipient of the advice, at a time reasonably contemporaneous with the initial provision of the advice, a written notification (which may consist of notification by means of electronic communication)—

“(i) of all fees or other compensation relating to the advice that the fiduciary adviser or any affiliate thereof is to receive (including compensation provided by any third party) in connection with the provision of the advice or in connection with the sale, acquisition, or holding of the security or other property,

“(ii) of any material affiliation or contractual relationship of the fiduciary adviser or affiliates thereof in the security or other property,

“(iii) of any limitation placed on the scope of the investment advice to be provided by the fiduciary adviser with respect to any such sale, acquisition, or holding of a security or other property,

“(iv) of the types of services provided by the fiduciary adviser in connection with the provision of investment advice by the fiduciary adviser, and

“(v) that the adviser is acting as a fiduciary of the plan in connection with the provision of the advice,

“(B) the fiduciary adviser provides appropriate disclosure, in connection with the sale, acquisition, or holding of the security or other property, in accordance with all applicable securities laws,

“(C) the sale, acquisition, or holding occurs solely at the direction of the recipient of the advice,

“(D) the compensation received by the fiduciary adviser and affiliates thereof in connection with the sale, acquisition, or holding of the security or other property is reasonable, and

“(E) the terms of the sale, acquisition, or holding of the security or other property are at least as favorable to the plan as an arm’s length transaction would be.

“(2) STANDARDS FOR PRESENTATION OF INFORMATION.—The notification required to be provided to participants and beneficiaries under paragraph (1)(A) shall be written in a clear and conspicuous manner and in a manner calculated to be understood by the average plan participant and shall be sufficiently accurate and comprehensive to reasonably apprise such participants and beneficiaries of the information required to be provided in the notification.

“(3) EXEMPTION CONDITIONED ON CONTINUED AVAILABILITY OF REQUIRED INFORMATION ON REQUEST FOR 1 YEAR.—The requirements of paragraph (1)(A) shall be deemed not to have been met in connection with the initial or

any subsequent provision of advice described in paragraph (1) to the plan, participant, or beneficiary if, at any time during the provision of advisory services to the plan, participant, or beneficiary, the fiduciary adviser fails to maintain the information described in clauses (i) through (iv) of subparagraph (A) in currently accurate form and in the manner described in paragraph (2) or fails—

“(A) to provide, without charge, such currently accurate information to the recipient of the advice no less than annually,

“(B) to make such currently accurate information available, upon request and without charge, to the recipient of the advice, or

“(C) in the event of a material change to the information described in clauses (i) through (iv) of paragraph (1)(A), to provide, without charge, such currently accurate information to the recipient of the advice at a time reasonably contemporaneous to the material change in information.

“(4) MAINTENANCE FOR 6 YEARS OF EVIDENCE OF COMPLIANCE.—A fiduciary adviser referred to in paragraph (1) who has provided advice referred to in such paragraph shall, for a period of not less than 6 years after the provision of the advice, maintain any records necessary for determining whether the requirements of the preceding provisions of this subsection and of subsection (b)(14) have been met. A transaction prohibited under section 406 shall not be considered to have occurred solely because the records are lost or destroyed prior to the end of the 6-year period due to circumstances beyond the control of the fiduciary adviser.

“(5) EXEMPTION FOR PLAN SPONSOR AND CERTAIN OTHER FIDUCIARIES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), a plan sponsor or other person who is a fiduciary (other than a fiduciary adviser) shall not be treated as failing to meet the requirements of this part solely by reason of the provision of investment advice referred to in section 3(21)(A)(ii) (or solely by reason of contracting for or otherwise arranging for the provision of the advice), if—

“(i) the advice is provided by a fiduciary adviser pursuant to an arrangement between the plan sponsor or other fiduciary and the fiduciary adviser for the provision by the fiduciary adviser of investment advice referred to in such section,

“(ii) the terms of the arrangement require compliance by the fiduciary adviser with the requirements of this subsection, and

“(iii) the terms of the arrangement include a written acknowledgment by the fiduciary adviser that the fiduciary adviser is a fiduciary of the plan with respect to the provision of the advice.

“(B) CONTINUED DUTY OF PRUDENT SELECTION OF ADVISER AND PERIODIC REVIEW.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed to exempt a plan sponsor or other person who is a fiduciary from any requirement of this part for the prudent selection and periodic review of a fiduciary adviser with whom the plan sponsor or other person enters into an arrangement for the provision of advice referred to in section 3(21)(A)(ii). The plan sponsor or other person who is a fiduciary has no duty under this part to monitor the specific investment advice given by the fiduciary adviser to any particular recipient of the advice.

“(C) AVAILABILITY OF PLAN ASSETS FOR PAYMENT FOR ADVICE.—Nothing in this part shall be construed to preclude the use of plan assets to pay for reasonable expenses in providing investment advice referred to in section 3(21)(A)(ii).

“(6) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection and subsection (b)(14)—

“(A) FIDUCIARY ADVISER.—The term ‘fiduciary adviser’ means, with respect to a plan, a person who is a fiduciary of the plan by

reason of the provision of investment advice by the person to the plan or to a participant or beneficiary and who is—

“(i) registered as an investment adviser under the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-1 et seq.) or under the laws of the State in which the fiduciary maintains its principal office and place of business,

“(ii) a bank or similar financial institution referred to in section 408(b)(4),

“(iii) an insurance company qualified to do business under the laws of a State,

“(iv) a person registered as a broker or dealer under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.),

“(v) an affiliate of a person described in any of clauses (i) through (iv), or

“(vi) an employee, agent, or registered representative of a person described in any of clauses (i) through (v) who satisfies the requirements of applicable insurance, banking, and securities laws relating to the provision of the advice.

“(B) AFFILIATE.—The term ‘affiliate’ of another entity means an affiliated person of the entity (as defined in section 2(a)(3) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-2(a)(3))).

“(C) REGISTERED REPRESENTATIVE.—The term ‘registered representative’ of another entity means a person described in section 3(a)(18) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)(18)) (substituting the entity for the broker or dealer referred to in such section) or a person described in section 202(a)(17) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-2(a)(17)) (substituting the entity for the investment adviser referred to in such section).”.

(b) AMENDMENTS TO THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.—

(1) EXEMPTION FROM PROHIBITED TRANSACTIONS.—Subsection (d) of section 4975 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to exemptions from tax on prohibited transactions) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (14), by striking “or” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (15), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(16) any transaction described in subsection (f)(7)(A) in connection with the provision of investment advice described in subsection (e)(3)(B), in any case in which—

“(A) the investment of assets of the plan is subject to the direction of plan participants or beneficiaries,

“(B) the advice is provided to the plan or a participant or beneficiary of the plan by a fiduciary adviser in connection with any sale, acquisition, or holding of a security or other property for purposes of investment of plan assets, and

“(C) the requirements of subsection (f)(7)(B) are met in connection with the provision of the advice.”.

(2) ALLOWED TRANSACTIONS AND REQUIREMENTS.—Subsection (f) of such section 4975 (relating to other definitions and special rules) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(7) PROVISIONS RELATING TO INVESTMENT ADVICE PROVIDED BY FIDUCIARY ADVISERS.—

“(A) TRANSACTIONS ALLOWABLE IN CONNECTION WITH INVESTMENT ADVICE PROVIDED BY FIDUCIARY ADVISERS.—The transactions referred to in subsection (d)(16), in connection with the provision of investment advice by a fiduciary adviser, are the following:

“(i) the provision of the advice to the plan, participant, or beneficiary;

“(ii) the sale, acquisition, or holding of a security or other property (including any lending of money or other extension of credit associated with the sale, acquisition, or

holding of a security or other property) pursuant to the advice; and

“(iii) the direct or indirect receipt of fees or other compensation by the fiduciary adviser or an affiliate thereof (or any employee, agent, or registered representative of the fiduciary adviser or affiliate) in connection with the provision of the advice or in connection with a sale, acquisition, or holding of a security or other property pursuant to the advice.

“(B) REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO PROVISION OF INVESTMENT ADVICE BY FIDUCIARY ADVISERS.—The requirements of this subparagraph (referred to in subsection (d)(16)(C)) are met in connection with the provision of investment advice referred to in subsection (e)(3)(B), provided to a plan or a participant or beneficiary of a plan by a fiduciary adviser with respect to the plan in connection with any sale, acquisition, or holding of a security or other property for purposes of investment of amounts held by the plan, if—

“(i) in the case of the initial provision of the advice with regard to the security or other property by the fiduciary adviser to the plan, participant, or beneficiary, the fiduciary adviser provides to the recipient of the advice, at a time reasonably contemporaneous with the initial provision of the advice, a written notification (which may consist of notification by means of electronic communication)—

“(I) of all fees or other compensation relating to the advice that the fiduciary adviser or any affiliate thereof is to receive (including compensation provided by any third party) in connection with the provision of the advice or in connection with the sale, acquisition, or holding of the security or other property,

“(II) of any material affiliation or contractual relationship of the fiduciary adviser or affiliates thereof in the security or other property,

“(III) of any limitation placed on the scope of the investment advice to be provided by the fiduciary adviser with respect to any such sale, acquisition, or holding of a security or other property,

“(IV) of the types of services provided by the fiduciary adviser in connection with the provision of investment advice by the fiduciary adviser, and

“(V) that the adviser is acting as a fiduciary of the plan in connection with the provision of the advice,

“(ii) the fiduciary adviser provides appropriate disclosure, in connection with the sale, acquisition, or holding of the security or other property, in accordance with all applicable securities laws,

“(iii) the sale, acquisition, or holding occurs solely at the direction of the recipient of the advice,

“(iv) the compensation received by the fiduciary adviser and affiliates thereof in connection with the sale, acquisition, or holding of the security or other property is reasonable, and

“(v) the terms of the sale, acquisition, or holding of the security or other property are at least as favorable to the plan as an arm's length transaction would be.

“(C) STANDARDS FOR PRESENTATION OF INFORMATION.—The notification required to be provided to participants and beneficiaries under subparagraph (B)(i) shall be written in a clear and conspicuous manner and in a manner calculated to be understood by the average plan participant and shall be sufficiently accurate and comprehensive to reasonably apprise such participants and beneficiaries of the information required to be provided in the notification.

“(D) EXEMPTION CONDITIONED ON MAKING REQUIRED INFORMATION AVAILABLE ANNUALLY, ON REQUEST, AND IN THE EVENT OF MATERIAL

CHANGE.—The requirements of subparagraph (B)(i) shall be deemed not to have been met in connection with the initial or any subsequent provision of advice described in subparagraph (B) to the plan, participant, or beneficiary if, at any time during the provision of advisory services to the plan, participant, or beneficiary, the fiduciary adviser fails to maintain the information described in subclauses (I) through (IV) of subparagraph (B)(i) in currently accurate form and in the manner required by subparagraph (C), or fails—

“(i) to provide, without charge, such currently accurate information to the recipient of the advice no less than annually,

“(ii) to make such currently accurate information available, upon request and without charge, to the recipient of the advice, or

“(iii) in the event of a material change to the information described in subclauses (I) through (IV) of subparagraph (B)(i), to provide, without charge, such currently accurate information to the recipient of the advice at a time reasonably contemporaneous to the material change in information.

“(E) MAINTENANCE FOR 6 YEARS OF EVIDENCE OF COMPLIANCE.—A fiduciary adviser referred to in subparagraph (B) who has provided advice referred to in such subparagraph shall, for a period of not less than 6 years after the provision of the advice, maintain any records necessary for determining whether the requirements of the preceding provisions of this paragraph and of subsection (d)(16) have been met. A transaction prohibited under subsection (c)(1) shall not be considered to have occurred solely because the records are lost or destroyed prior to the end of the 6-year period due to circumstances beyond the control of the fiduciary adviser.

“(F) EXEMPTION FOR PLAN SPONSOR AND CERTAIN OTHER FIDUCIARIES.—A plan sponsor or other person who is a fiduciary (other than a fiduciary adviser) shall not be treated as failing to meet the requirements of this section solely by reason of the provision of investment advice referred to in subsection (e)(3)(B) (or solely by reason of contracting for or otherwise arranging for the provision of the advice), if—

“(i) the advice is provided by a fiduciary adviser pursuant to an arrangement between the plan sponsor or other fiduciary and the fiduciary adviser for the provision by the fiduciary adviser of investment advice referred to in such section,

“(ii) the terms of the arrangement require compliance by the fiduciary adviser with the requirements of this paragraph,

“(iii) the terms of the arrangement include a written acknowledgment by the fiduciary adviser that the fiduciary adviser is a fiduciary of the plan with respect to the provision of the advice, and

“(iv) the requirements of part 4 of subtitle B of title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 are met in connection with the provision of such advice.

“(G) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this paragraph and subsection (d)(16)—

“(i) FIDUCIARY ADVISER.—The term ‘fiduciary adviser’ means, with respect to a plan, a person who is a fiduciary of the plan by reason of the provision of investment advice by the person to the plan or to a participant or beneficiary and who is—

“(I) registered as an investment adviser under the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-1 et seq.) or under the laws of the State in which the fiduciary maintains its principal office and place of business,

“(II) a bank or similar financial institution referred to in subsection (d)(4),

“(III) an insurance company qualified to do business under the laws of a State,

“(IV) a person registered as a broker or dealer under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.),

“(V) an affiliate of a person described in any of subclauses (I) through (IV), or

“(VI) an employee, agent, or registered representative of a person described in any of subclauses (I) through (V) who satisfies the requirements of applicable insurance, banking, and securities laws relating to the provision of the advice.

“(ii) AFFILIATE.—The term ‘affiliate’ of another entity means an affiliated person of the entity (as defined in section 2(a)(3) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-2(a)(3))).

“(iii) REGISTERED REPRESENTATIVE.—The term ‘registered representative’ of another entity means a person described in section 3(a)(18) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)(18)) (substituting the entity for the broker or dealer referred to in such section) or a person described in section 202(a)(17) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-2(a)(17)) (substituting the entity for the investment adviser referred to in such section).”

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 1980. A bill to require a training program for all airline personnel responsible for checking passenger identification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 1981. A bill to enhance penalties for fraud in connection with identification documents that facilitates an act of domestic terrorism; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, today I am introducing two bills to help prevent terrorists from using false identification to gain access to our Nation's airports and airplanes.

The tragic events of September 11 taught our Nation and the world a very harsh lesson about the safety of our skies. Congress responded by drafting and passing legislation to ensure enhanced security at our airports and on our airplanes. I worked hard with my colleagues on the Senate Commerce Committee to increase the security of our Nation's skies, and we succeeded in passing an airline security bill.

However, there is still more we can do. Current law does not go far enough when it comes to guarding against the use of fake IDs by terrorists. The importance of this fact cannot be underestimated. As we now know, some of the terrorists who hijacked the planes on September 11 did indeed use fake IDs to board the planes. My two bills include three “T”s to prevent terrorists from using false identification—technology, training, and tough sentences.

First, the legislation I am introducing today will mandate training for airline personnel who are responsible for checking the identification of passengers.

Second, my legislation would provide technology to catch fraudulent IDs. It would require the placement of ID technology in every airport across the Nation. This technology would check

the validity of passengers' IDs, and could also include optical or facial scanners to determine if an individual is in a terrorist database. These technologies are out there, they're ready for use, and our airports should be using them starting now.

Finally, I propose legislation to mandate prison time for anyone who produces, transfers, possesses, or uses a fake ID in connection with terrorism. Currently, in Federal law, there is no mandatory imprisonment for the production, transfer, possession, or use of a fake ID. Under any circumstances, even in relation to terrorist acts. This, to me, seems wrong. If you at any point and time facilitate an act of terrorism by providing someone with a fake ID, making a fake ID, possessing a fake ID, or using that fake ID, you should go to jail. Period. My bill makes sure that principle is reflected in Federal law.

Last, my bill closes the loophole that punishes people for fake IDs used in acts of international terrorism, but not domestic terrorism. Under the USA PATRIOT Act the Congress passed last year, a definition of "domestic terrorism" was added to the criminal code. My bill makes sure that fake ID offenses related to domestic terrorism get the same punishment as those relating to international terrorism.

It simply is not enough to have sporadic safeguards in a handful of airports. The bills I am introducing today will help close loopholes that currently serve as wide open doors for terrorists.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2964. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2885 submitted by Mr. GRASSLEY and intended to be proposed to the bill (S. 565) to establish the Commission on Voting Rights and Procedures to study and make recommendations regarding election technology, voting, and election administration, to establish a grant program under which the Office of Justice Programs and the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice shall provide assistance to States and localities in improving election technology and the administration of Federal elections, to require States to meet uniform and nondiscriminatory election technology and administration requirements for the 2004 Federal elections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2965. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2885 submitted by Mr. GRASSLEY and intended to be proposed to the bill (S. 565) supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2964. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2885 submitted by Mr. GRASSLEY and intended to be proposed to the bill (S. 565) to establish the Commission on Voting Rights and Procedures to study and make recommendations regarding election tech-

nology, voting and election administration to establish a grant program under which the Office of Justice Programs and the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice shall provide assistance to States and localities in improving election technology and the administration of Federal elections, to require States to meet uniform and nondiscriminatory election technology and administration requirements for the 2004 Federal elections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

(4) INTERACTION WITH FEDERAL INFORMATION.—

(A) ACCESS TO FEDERAL INFORMATION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commissioner of Social Security, the Attorney General, and the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service shall provide, upon request from a State or locality maintaining a computerized centralized list implemented under paragraph (1), only such information as is necessary to determine the eligibility of an individual to vote in such State or locality under the law of the State or locality. Any State or locality that receives information under this clause may only share such information with election officials.

(ii) PROCEDURE.—The records under clause (i) shall be provided in such place and such manner as the applicable agency head determines appropriate to protect and prevent the misuse of information.

(iii) DUPLICATIVE INFORMATION.—If a State or locality is provided with access to applicable records under clause (i), any other State or locality may access such records through the State or locality that had access to the records under such clause.

(B) APPLICABLE RECORDS.—For purposes of this subsection, the term "applicable records" means—

(i) in the case of the Commissioner of Social Security, information needed to verify—

(I) the social security number of an individual; or

(II) whether such individual is shown on the records of the Commissioner of Social Security as being alive or deceased;

(ii) in the case of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, information needed to verify whether or not an individual is a citizen of the United States or lawfully admitted for permanent residence; and

(iii) in the case of the Attorney General, information regarding felony convictions of individuals.

(C) EXCEPTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to any request for a record of an individual if the applicable agency head determines there are exceptional circumstances warranting an exception (such as safety of the individual or interference with an investigation).

SA 2965. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2885 submitted by Mr. GRASSLEY and intended to be proposed to the bill (S. 565) to establish the Commission on Voting Rights and Procedures to study and make recommendations regarding election technology, voting and election administration to establish a grant program under which the Office of Justice Programs and the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice shall pro-

vide assistance to States and localities in improving election technology and the administration of Federal elections, to require States to meet uniform and nondiscriminatory election technology and administration requirements for the 2004 Federal elections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

(4) INTERACTION WITH FEDERAL INFORMATION.—

(A) ACCESS TO FEDERAL INFORMATION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commissioner of Social Security, the Attorney General, and the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service shall provide, upon request from a State or locality maintaining a computerized centralized list implemented under paragraph (1), only such information as is necessary to determine the eligibility of an individual to vote in such State or locality under the law of the State or locality. Any State or locality that receives information under this clause may only share such information with election officials.

(ii) PROCEDURE.—The information under clause (i) shall be provided in such place and such manner as the applicable agency head determines appropriate to protect and prevent the misuse of information.

(iii) DUPLICATIVE INFORMATION.—If a State or locality is provided with applicable information under clause (i), any other State or locality may access such information through the State or locality that was provided with information under such clause.

(B) APPLICABLE INFORMATION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term "applicable information" means—

(i) in the case of the Commissioner of Social Security, information regarding whether—

(I) the name and social security number of an individual provided to the Commissioner match the information contained in the Commissioner's records; or

(II) such individual is shown on the records of the Commissioner as being deceased;

(ii) in the case of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, information needed to verify whether or not an individual is a citizen of the United States or lawfully admitted for permanent residence; and

(iii) in the case of the Attorney General, information regarding felony convictions of individuals.

(C) EXCEPTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to any request for a record of an individual if the applicable agency head determines there are exceptional circumstances warranting an exception (such as safety of the individual or interference with an investigation).

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to hold a business meeting during the session of the Senate on Friday, March 1, in the morning at a time to be announced. The purpose of the business meeting is to consider the committee views and

estimates on the fiscal year 2003 budget, and Dr. Raymond L. Orbach's nomination to be Director of the Office of Science, Department of Energy.

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

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Governmental Affairs' Subcommittee on International Security, Proliferation and Federal Services be

authorized to meet on Friday, March 1, 2002, at 10 a.m. for a hearing regarding "U.S. Policy in Iraq: Next Steps."

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

FOREIGN CURRENCY REPORTS

In accordance with the appropriate provisions of law, the Secretary of the Senate herewith submits the following report(s) of standing committees of the Senate, certain joint committees of the Congress, delegations and groups, and select and special committees of the Senate, relating to expenses incurred in the performance of authorized foreign travel:

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2001

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Carl Levin:									
United Kingdom	Pound		72.00						72.00
Uzbekistan	Pound		168.00						168.00
Oman	Rial		168.00						168.00
Greece	Drachma		76.00						76.00
Hungary	Forint		192.00						192.00
David S. Lyles:									
United Kingdom	Pound		67.00						67.00
Uzbekistan	Pound		165.00						165.00
Oman	Rial		207.00						207.00
Greece	Drachma		76.00						76.00
Hungary	Forint		188.00						188.00
Senator John Warner:									
United Kingdom	Dollar		81.00						81.00
Uzbekistan	Dollar		371.00						371.00
Oman	Dollar		178.00						178.00
Hungary	Forint		334.00						334.00
Greece	Dollar		106.00						106.00
Judith A. Ansley:									
United Kingdom	Dollar		61.00						61.00
Uzbekistan	Dollar		143.00						143.00
Oman	Dollar		128.00						128.00
Hungary	Forint		199.00						199.00
Greece	Dollar		46.00						46.00
Richard D. DeBobes:									
United Kingdom	Dollar		61.00						61.00
Uzbekistan	Dollar		146.00						146.00
Oman	Dollar		195.00						195.00
Greece	Dollar		76.00						76.00
Hungary	Dollar		194.00				25.00		219.00
Total		3,698.00				25.00		3,723.00

CARL LEVIN,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, Jan. 2, 2002.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), DASCHLE'S CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION FOR TRAVEL FROM NOV. 16 TO NOV. 18, 2001

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Tom Daschle:									
Mexico	Peso	646.00	646.00
John Elsold:									
Mexico	Peso	588.69	588.69
Andrea LaRue:									
Mexico	Peso	496.00	496.00
Denis McDonough:									
Mexico	Peso	580.00	580.00
Sally Walsh:									
Mexico	Peso	646.00	646.00
Delegation Expenses: ¹									
Mexico	Peso	7,539.17	7,539.17
Total	2,956.69	7,539.17	10,495.86

¹ Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State and the Department of Defense under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 950384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

TOM DASCHLE,
Majority Leader, Jan. 28, 2002.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON THE COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2001

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Robert Hand:									
U.S.A	Dollar				1,469.95				1,469.95
Austria	Dollar		146.00						146.00
Kosovo	Dollar		798.00						798.00
Representative Alcee Hastings:									
U.S.A	Dollar				5,039.46				5,039.46

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON THE COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2001—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Romania	Dollar		440.00						440.00
Janice Helwig:									
U.S.A.	Dollar				5,374.45				5,374.45
Austria	Dollar		11,944.06		832.44				12,776.50
Germany	Dollar		432.00						432.00
Austria	Dollar				3,422.09				3,422.09
Kyrgyzstan	Dollar		1,309.00						1,309.00
Austria	Dollar				1,115.00				1,115.00
Romania	Dollar		1,100.00						1,100.00
Representative Steny Hoyer:									
U.S.A.	Dollar				5,039.46				5,039.46
Romania	Dollar		440.00						440.00
Total			16,609.06		22,292.85				38,901.91

BEN NIGHORSE CAMPBELL,
Chairman, Committee on the Commission on Security and
Cooperation in Europe, Jan. 31, 2002.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2001

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Christopher Bond:									
England	Dollar		688.00		7,826.86				8,514.86
Belgium	Dollar		514.00						514.00
Germany	Dollar		798.00						798.00
Total			2,000.00		7,826.86				9,826.86

JOHN F. KERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship,
Feb. 5, 2002.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FINANCE FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2001

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Ted Posner:									
Switzerland	Franc	1,018.46	509.23		961.03				1,356.32
Cary D. Pugh:									
Switzerland	Franc	1,018.46	509.23		1,270.98				1,550.75
Angela Marshall:									
Canada	Dollar		626.13		332.80				958.93
Total			1,644.59		2,564.81				3,866.00

MAX BAUCUS,
Chairman, Committee on Finance, Jan. 15, 2002.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), MAJORITY LEADER, FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2001

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Franz Wuerfmannsdobler:									
Morocco	Dollar		1,300.00						1,300.00
United States	Dollar				4,490.27				4,490.27
Total			1,300.00		4,490.27				5,790.27

TOM DASCHLE,
Majority Leader, Jan. 31, 2002.

*AMENDMENT TO 3D QUARTER 2001 REPORT—CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE,
UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 2001

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Joseph I. Lieberman:									
Mexico	Dollar		380.00						380.00
Colombia	Dollar		249.00				312.00		561.00
Costa Rica	Dollar		977.00						977.00
Frederick M. Downey:									
Mexico	Dollar		300.00				100.00		400.00
Colombia	Dollar		228.00				150.00		378.00
Costa Rica	Dollar		572.00				233.00		805.00

*AMENDMENT TO 3D QUARTER 2001 REPORT—CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 2001—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator John McCain:									
Estonia	Kroon	455.55	455.55
Bulgaria	Dollar	214.00	214.00
Czech Republic	Koruna	303.00	303.00
United States	Dollar	8,436.63	8,436.63
Daniel C. Twining:									
Estonia	Kroon	578.91	578.91
Bulgaria	Dollar	292.00	292.00
Czech Republic	Koruna	303.00	303.00
United States	Dollar	4,812.83	4,812.83
Total	4,852.46	13,249.46	795.00	18,896.92

CARL LEVIN,
Chairman, Armed Services Committee, Oct. 1, 2001.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 2001

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
<hr/>									
Senator Phil Gramm:									
England	Dollar	1,367.60	5,202.85	6,570.45
Senator Larry Neal:									
England	Dollar	1,390.30	5,202.85	6,593.15
Total	2,757.90	10,405.70	13,163.60

PAUL S. SARBANES,
Chairman, Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, Nov. 6, 2001.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE AND TRANSPORTATION FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 2001

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Robert W. Chamberlin:									
France	Franc	1,249.00	1,072.70	2,321.70
Samuel E. Whitehorn:									
France	Franc	1,249.00	1,072.70	2,321.70
Total	2,498.00	2,145.40	4,643.40

FRITZ HOLLINGS,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation,
Dec. 6, 2001.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 2001

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Timothy Profeta:									
Germany			630.00		1,278.90				1,908.90
Total			630.00		1,278.90				1,908.90

JIM JEFFORDS,
Chairman, Committee on Environment and Public Works, Feb. 11, 2002.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FINANCE FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 2001

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator John D. Rockefeller:									
Japan	Yen	183,760	1,473.02	8,634.16	10,107.18
Andrew Quinn:									
Japan	Yen	183,760	1,422.27	5,598.16	7,020.43
Greg Mastel:									
British Columbia	Dollar	800.00	808.63	1,608.63
Total	3,695.29	15,040.95	18,736.24

MAX BAUCUS,
Chairman, Committee on Finance, October 2, 2001.

AMENDMENT TO 2ND QUARTER REPORT—CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FINANCE FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2001

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Richard Chriss:									
Canada		263.76	71.17		890.32				916.49
Total			71.17		890.32				961.49

MAX BAUCUS,
Chairman, Committee on Finance, Sept. 30, 2001.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 2001

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Mitchel B. Kugler:									
Marshall Islands	Dollar		700.00		1,723.26				2,423.26
Senator Thompson:									
Taiwan	Dollar		185.15						185.15
China	Yuan		417.00						417.00
Korea	Won		0.00						0.00
Howard S. Liebengood:									
Taiwan	Dollar		141.00						141.00
China	Yuan		185.98						185.98
Korea	Won		80.00						80.00
Total			1,709.13		1,723.26				3,432.39

JOSEPH LIEBERMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Governmental Affairs, Oct. 1, 2001.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 2001

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Bob Graham			1,383.00						1,383.00
Senator Jon Kyl			1,383.00						1,383.00
Paula DeSutter			1,198.00						1,198.00
Total			3,964.00						3,964.00

BOB GRAHAM,
Chairman, Committee on Intelligence, Feb. 4, 2002.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON THE COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 2001

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Orest Deychakiwsky:									
U.S.A.	Dollar				5,278.00				5,278.00
Belarus	Dollar		630.00						630.00
U.S.A.	Dollar				4,031.00				4,031.00
Poland	Dollar		1,897.00						1,897.00
Janice Helwig:									
U.S.A.	Dollar				5,374.45				5,374.45
Austria	Dollar		13,312.43						13,312.43
Austria	Dollar				479.00				479.00
Poland	Dollar		2,949.51						2,949.51
Ronald McNamara:									
U.S.A.	Dollar				5,278.00				5,278.00
Belarus	Dollar		630.00						630.00
Erika Schlager:									
U.S.A.	Dollar				4,957.12				4,957.12
Romania	Dollar		416.58						416.58
Poland	Dollar		1,758.25						1,758.25
Dorothy Taft:									
U.S.A.	Dollar				1,295.18				1,295.18
Poland	Dollar		1,066.34						1,066.34
Knox Thames:									
U.S.A.	Dollar				4,929.71				4,929.71
Poland	Dollar		1,132.00						1,132.00
Maureen Walsh:									
U.S.A.	Dollar				4,031.65				4,031.65
Poland	Dollar		1,980.37						1,980.37
Total			25,772.48		35,654.11				61,426.59

BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL,
Chairman, Committee on the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, Nov. 7, 2001.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON U.S. DELEGATION TO THE PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY OF THE ORGANIZATION FOR SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE FOR TRAVEL FROM
JULY 4 TO JULY 10, 2001

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Ben Nighthorse Campbell:									
U.S.A.	Dollar								
France	Dollar		2,173.52						2,173.52
Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison:									
U.S.A.	Dollar				1,778.28				1,778.28
France	Dollar		1,545.00						1,545.00
Ronald J. McNamara:									
U.S.A.	Dollar								
France	Dollar		1,973.52						1,973.52
Michael Russell:									
U.S.A.	Dollar								
France	Dollar		1,905.52						1,905.52
Senator George V. Voinovich:									
U.S.A.	Dollar								
France	Dollar		1,875.14						1,875.14
Delegation Expenses:									
France	Dollar						15,904.00		15,904.00
Total			9,472.70		1,778.28		15,904.00		27,154.98

BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL,
Chairman, Committee on the Commission on Security and
Cooperation in Europe, Nov. 7, 2001.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), REPUBLICAN LEADER FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 2001

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Mike Russell:									
France	Dollar		1,905.52						1,905.52
Senator Arlen Specter:									
Taiwan	Dollar		135.86						135.86
South Korea	Dollar		198.19						198.19
China	Dollar		797.02						797.02
John Klemmer:									
Taiwan	Dollar		273.24						273.24
South Korea	Dollar		268.65						268.65
China	Dollar		759.56						759.56
Alison DeKosky:									
Taiwan	Dollar		197.23						197.23
South Korea	Dollar		261.65						261.65
China	Dollar		525.17						525.17
Total			5,322.09						5,322.09

TRENT LOTT,
Republican Leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION DISCHARGED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session; that the HELP Committee be discharged from further consideration of the following nomination, and that the Senate proceed to its consideration: Leslie Silverman, to be a member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission; further, that the nomination be confirmed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, any statements relating to the nomination be printed in the RECORD, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate return to legislative session.

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

The nomination was considered and confirmed, as follows:

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

Leslie Silverman, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for the remainder of the term expiring July 1, 2003.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now return to legislative session.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT
AGREEMENT—S. 565

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to proceed to the motion to reconsider be agreed to; that the motion to reconsider be agreed to; and that at 6 p.m., Monday, March 4, there be 15 minutes for debate, equally debated and controlled by Senators DODD and MCCONNELL, or their designees; that at 6:15 p.m., the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on S. 565; further, that Senators have until 5:15 p.m. on Monday to file second-degree amendments.

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

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MARCH 4,
2002

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it ad-

journal until the hour of 4 p.m., Monday, March 4. I further ask unanimous consent that following the prayer and the pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and there be a period for morning business until 6 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided between the two leaders, or their designees; further, at 6 p.m., the Senate resume consideration of the election reform bill.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the next rollcall vote will occur at 6:15 p.m. on Monday on cloture on the election reform bill.

ELECTION REFORM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I see the manager of the election reform bill coming into the Chamber. He has

worked so hard on it. In fact, he worked last night and is still working on it. I am glad he has come out of the bowels of the Senate where he has been working and has come to the Senate Chamber. I would be glad to hear from the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Nevada, the distinguished Democratic majority assistant floor leader, for yielding.

To give some flavor and idea about where this is, let me thank, first of all, Senator DASCHLE, the majority leader. His patience—I may be testing it. I hope I am not. I have such deep affection for my leader, and he has been generous beyond belief, and his staff's cooperation has been just stunning. I want to publicly thank them.

I thank my Republican colleagues. I thank Senator LOTT as well. I know he is feeling a certain amount of pressure from his Members, too. I know there are other issues with which this body needs to grapple in debate on. I am very in tune with that desire. It certainly was not our intent that this matter end up taking as long as it has. In fact, I had predicted it might take substantially less time. However, how we ended up—when we have a matter such as this one cannot accurately predict with any certainty what is going to happen. Actually, we ended up in a logjam earlier this week on the Schumer-Wyden amendment, with Senator BOND and other Members.

I am prepared to say we are literally attempting to resolve this issue as I speak. We do not have it in writing yet in final form. It appears that we are not going to have it this afternoon based on my conversations. I thank the staffs of Senator MCCONNELL and Senator BOND. Both Brian Lewis and Leon Sequeira of Senator MCCONNELL's office and Julie Dammann and Jack Bartling of Senator BOND's office have been very supportive and helpful. I thank particularly Senator BOND's staff, Jack Bartling, who worked with me last night until almost midnight to try to work out appropriate language. Again, today we have spent any number of hours in our cloakrooms trying to come together with some bipartisan language that is very important to those of us who are interested in completing action on this compromise election reform bill.

There has been concern this bill might die because we have not been able to resolve certain issues. That is not going to happen today. This bill is going to be resolved, in my view, by Monday night or Tuesday morning at the latest. Then we will be able to get on to other business in the Senate.

We do not have a unanimous consent request to that effect, and I have urged not to propose one. I do not want to find myself having the UC become a vehicle for some people taking advantage of these circumstances.

I think the managers of the bill on the minority side are committed to getting this bill done. I thank them for

that. We have come a long way. We have some amendments yet to resolve. We have not voted on everything. However, we will on Monday consider remaining amendments and work on some compromise where needed. Over the weekend, the staffs will be finalizing some language, and then on Monday night we have a cloture vote, as I understand it, at 6:15 p.m. My hope is that, regardless of the outcome of that cloture vote, we will then consider amendments that evening with the possibility of stacking some votes Tuesday morning. This will be considered in light of the fact that some Members may not be back even for the cloture vote on Monday night.

We would accommodate them in such a way that we would have the stacked votes, go to third reading, and complete work on this bill by Tuesday morning. That is my desire. I further believe it is the desire of Senator MCCONNELL and the desire of Senator BOND and others who have been involved with this process. That is not a suggestion that they would accept the unanimous consent request to provide for such. However, I believe their intent and their desire is to mutually achieve the same goal as I seek to achieve.

In this body, the Senate works on comity. We look each other in the eye and we make commitments to each other to the extent we can fulfill them. I still believe this may be one of the few institutions left in America where you do not need a written contract to achieve those agreements. So I am working on the assumption that my colleagues are as committed as I am to seeing this unique and historic legislation become the law of the land with respect to the administration of elections for Federal office.

I apologize to my colleagues for taking so much time. I am sorry it has gone to this length. However, when you are legislating in something this unique and this novel, that goes to the very heart of who we are as a democracy and how we cast and count our ballots for the most important offices in our land, then there are an awful lot of people who are at the table. Even the legislative process is inclusive, not exclusive.

The Presiding Officer on several occasions has been in the chair. I say to my colleagues, he knows these matters that have been discussed over the last number of days. He is a former secretary of state. He knows these issues as well as anyone—in fact, better than anyone in the Chamber probably, given his most recent work in the area. So he knows when I speak that there is deep interest at a local level from all the local election administrators and officials in this subject matter. I do not have to mention that this is also the case for all the secretaries of state across the country, obviously all of us in the Senate, the people in the other Chamber, and people at the White House.

There are a lot of people who are at the table when you are discussing the future of how elections are going to be conducted in light of what happened in the November 2000 elections for Federal office and what had occurred in previous Presidential elections. So this is a major undertaking. It is not an annual appropriations bill. It is a fundamental change in how we are going to do some things with respect to Federal elections. We think we have been inclusive and worked in a very cooperative fashion with our States and localities. I should have maybe anticipated it might have taken a bit more time. I guess my optimism for the bill exceeded my ability to see how many people would like to be heard and offer ideas to the underlying proposal we brought to the Chamber now 2 weeks ago.

So I commit to my colleagues I will do everything I can to get this done at the very first of the week. I make this commitment to the distinguished assistant Democratic leader and to the majority leader and to others who I know are very anxious to get moving on other matters. I will not stand in the way of that occurring if you will give me a bit more of a window to try to achieve what I have sought to do over these last couple of weeks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Before the Senator from Connecticut leaves, I say to him I have been involved in the legislative process a long time at a State level and in Congress. The Senator from Connecticut has been in the Congress longer than I, but I have been tremendously impressed the last several days by the Senator from Connecticut. I have to say I think most people would have given up by now, but the Senator from Connecticut has a vision as to what this legislation will do for our country, what it will do for the State of Nevada.

The Senator from Connecticut has spoken to our secretary of state, a Republican, by the name of Dean Heller—

Mr. DODD. He is a good man.

Mr. REID. Who loves this legislation. This legislation for my State is very important.

I spoke a little bit yesterday indicating in 1998 the nightmare of my election. Because the State has so few resources outside of Clark County, the very populous Las Vegas area, in Reno one registrar of voters tried to save a few dollars and printed their own ballots, causing all kinds of problems because of antiquated machines. With this legislation, that would be taken care of. The State of Nevada would have help to have elections, and all 17 counties would have fair elections.

So, as I said, I think most people would have given up.

I have to say the strength and the depth of feelings of the Senator from Connecticut is something we do not often see—a Senator sitting down at a table with not another Senator there, with only staff representing various

Senators in this institution. I have not seen that very often. That portrays, to me, how the Senator feels about this.

The Senator and I have spoken off the Senate floor about the importance of this legislation. In the last few minutes of the Senator's statement today, he talked about this legislation being historic. This will give the opportunity to vote to people who have never had the opportunity to vote. It will cause people to go to the voting booth who will no longer feel demeaned because they cannot hear or see or they have some other handicap. They will be able to vote now.

The Senator from Connecticut has shown tremendous courage in going forward with this legislation. I have to say I only hope, after the many times the Senator from Connecticut has tried to get this legislation passed, that it gets passed. In fairness and justice, it needs to pass. I hope over this weekend people reach out to the Senator from Connecticut and indicate how important it is that he stick to what he is doing because this certainly—the Senator has had many remarkable accomplishments in his career, while I have been in the Senate with him, not the least of which is being the quarterback of the campaign finance reform. But I hope this legislation is able to go forward because our country deserves it and the Senator from Connecticut deserves it.

Mr. DODD. I thank the assistant leader and again I thank the other staff, Brian Lewis and Leon Sequeira of Senator McCONNELL's and Julie Dammann and Jack Bartling of Senator BOND's staff. I thank my own staff as well, Ronnie Gillespie, Kennie Gill, and Shawn Maher specifically. I would also like to include in the record a special thanks and appreciation for two interns, Laura Roubicek and Candace Chin, who have both taken extraordinary measures to support election reform and bring the this landmark legislation to final passage. There are also many others in my office who have done a terrific job as well and I thank each and every one of them. I thank the people from the civil rights community. We spent about 5 hours yesterday going over what this bill does and what are its shortcomings and what are its strengths.

Before this debate is complete, I will list all the groups around the country participating in this effort and have been at the table, including yesterday, who bring a passion and interest in fairness and justice that I wish America could have watched. We only have cameras in the Chamber and in committee rooms, but this was not a hearing, it was a group of people sitting down trying to figure out what was right for justice, for people who are in the corners, who fall through the cracks too often when we talk about legislation.

I was deeply proud as an American to be sitting in that room listening to people who do not hold an elective of-

fice, do not run for office, but fight on behalf of the people they represent.

I thank CORRINE BROWN, Congresswoman from Florida, for whom, as I said yesterday, this is not an intellectual issue alone. It is one she feels passionately about. She watched all that happened in her own congressional district in Florida. Others in attendance included EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, the chairperson of the Congressional Black Caucus; SYLVESTRE REYES, head of the Hispanic caucus in the House; and JOHN CONYERS, Ranking Member of the House Judiciary Committee and co-author of the original Dodd-Conyers election reform bill. They were all present at this gathering yesterday to talk about the importance of this compromise bill and how valuable it is to move forward and complete the legislative process.

Even if it means, as part of what I think the arrangement will be, withdrawal of the Schumer-Wyden proposal, and consideration of a package of civil rights provisions that will protect and preserve existing civil rights laws as they are and administrative provisions dealing with some state and local issues as well. That is the way we are going to try to get through this Gordian knot that sits on the path to final passage of the legislation.

There are a lot of people who were disappointed that the final result is going to be that the Schumer-Wyden amendment may be withdrawn from this bill at this particular point. However, there are others, such as Congresswoman CORRINE BROWN, who will tell you while she is disappointed about that, she understands there are a lot of other things to recommend in this bill, such as the very strong provisions in this bill.

Congresswoman BROWN spoke passionately about the compromise bill and moving forward, as have EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, SYLVESTRE REYES, and JOHN CONYERS. That in no way should reflect their disappointment over the fact that Schumer-Wyden may not be part of this bill. It deals with the situation where a person who registers by mail but does not provide identification in the mail-in registration package, and then shows up in person to vote. Under our compromise bill, that voter would have three alternatives to cast a vote. First, that voter could provide a photo ID and then cast an actual ballot. Next, that voter could provide any of the documents listed in the bill, such as a utility bill, and cast an actual ballot. Finally, that voter could not present any identification and then be eligible to cast a provisional ballot, not an actual ballot. The Schumer-Wyden amendments permits two additional alternatives for that voter to cast a ballot on election day. The Schumer-Wyden amendment would add both the alternative of voter signature verification and attestation as legitimate methods for such first time voters who register by mail and want to come in to vote in person to cast a

vote on election day. Under our compromise law, without the Schumer-Wyden proposal, that voter could still vote, but it would be a provisional ballot and would count only when the registration was corroborated.

I don't know the approximate number of how many fit into that category. Even if it is a few, it is wrong, in my view. But I understand the passions and feelings of my colleagues from Missouri and others are such to stop this bill in its entirety from going forward.

The Senator from Nevada mentioned those who are disabled. I have a sister who is blind. I have talked about her in the past. She represents the National Federation of the Blind in my State. Her eyesight is such she can see some things. She is a teacher and has been for 35 years. The idea that a person who is blind has never been able to cast a ballot in private, independently in the same manner as others, in the history of our country, is changed with the underlying law.

If this bill becomes law, no longer will millions of Americans have to rely on somebody else to walk into a voting booth to be told how they will cast a ballot. For the first time in the history of this country we will have voting systems in every precinct in America that allows people to cast the independent and private ballot—for those who are disabled, those who are blind—and we do it by paying for it, not by asking local States and jurisdictions to do so because we think it is the right thing to do.

For the first time in the history of our country, a person will be able to cast a ballot, and in fact check how they voted. They will know whether or not they overvoted. That is included in this legislation as well. There will be provisional voting process for every voter in America, in all 50 States and the District of Columbia, so they can go in and if there is a battle over whether they are properly registered, they can cast the provisional ballot, and it will be counted and not be thrown out. We require statewide voter registration, which will go to the heart of the fraud issues in many respects. I mentioned the disabled provisions, the language minorities provisions. We expand the numbers of language minorities now included in the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

This bill establishes a permanent commission on elections at the request of Senator McCONNELL of Kentucky. We have never had one before charged with Federal elections. It will give a permanent place so that we will not have to go through this process of waiting for a crisis to occur and come to the Congress of the United States to fix something. We will have a place where we can reform and modernize our election process so it will serve the voters of this country over and over again, as well as the election administrators.

The antifraud provisions, the open access of the voting process for others,

as well as the provisions for the disability community and our language minorities are major achievements. These are the reasons why CORRINE BROWN, why EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, and why JOHN CONYERS, why SYLVESTRE REYES all believe this is the right thing to do. Even though there is a provision in this bill with which they will end up disagreeing, their view is, go forward, get to Senate-House conference, see if we cannot work out other differences and pass landmark legislation.

The White House will be involved. We are not done with this. I believe we can get out of the Senate with a good bill, as I believe we can get to conference, resolve it with the Ney-Hoyer bill, and come back for the 2002 elections this year.

The President has put \$1.2 billion in Fiscal Year 2003 budget for election reform issues. There is no reason the \$400 million provided in the bill cannot be drawn down by States so voters who vote this fall can see changes they never would have imagined occurring as quickly as they can.

That is what is at stake. That is how we hope to resolve the roadblock in this process. We are aware and are working on the Oregon and Washington issue. Senators WYDEN and GORDON SMITH and PATTY MURRAY and MARIA CANTWELL have spoken eloquently on behalf of their unique situation on how they conduct vote by mail Federal elections and cast and count ballots. We are trying to accommodate them. Our goal in this bill has never been to deprive a State of the ability to conduct its elections in the unique way they do. We are trying to accommodate their interests.

I apologize for reviewing where things are. I want people to know how much is at stake. This is not another bill we are dealing with, as the Senator from Nevada has graciously pointed out. This is fundamental. Thomas Paine said more than 200 years ago, this is the primary right to vote, upon which all other rights depend. If you get this one wrong, it is awfully hard to get the other ones right. We are talking about something that is so important to the long-term health and well-being of our Nation. We saw how much harm was done, how many people were hurt in the 2002 elections when things went wrong. We bear a responsibility as the national legislative body to come up and respond to what occurred in this country in 2002 and occurred before that. We only became aware of it to the extent we did because of what happened in the Presidential race.

The country believes we need to make this process work better. It is in shoddy condition. To engage in this Congress and not engage this question would be a shortcoming we should not endure. We must accept and meet this challenge. I apologize to my colleagues, particularly the leadership, for the time this has taken. It is my fervent hope we are coming down to the final few hours of this. This is the last major hurdle. It is not to minimize the significance of other amendments that Members have, but this is a major battle between a House divided in many ways, as we saw by the vote that occurred on the tabling motion, almost 50-50 in terms of how people felt. If we get beyond that and deal with the other issues, I am fairly hopeful by Monday night or Tuesday morning

Members will have an opportunity to vote on the first election reform proposal before this body of this size almost in 40 years, since the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

I don't know what else we will accomplish in this Congress, but I hope at the end of the day when we look at the 107th Congress we can point to this landmark election reform bill as one of the significant achievements of this Congress.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 4 P.M. MONDAY, MARCH 4, 2002

Mr. REID. I believe there is no further business to come before the Senate; therefore, I ask unanimous consent the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 2:15 p.m., adjourned until Monday, March 4, 2002, at 4 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nomination received by the Senate March 1, 2002:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

JOHN R. EDWARDS, OF VERMONT, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF VERMONT FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE JOHN HOLLINGSWORTH SINCLAIR.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 1, 2002:

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

LESLIE SILVERMAN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2003.