

EXHIBIT G

28 of 35 DOCUMENTS

Congressional Record -- Senate

Friday, May 7, 1993

103rd Cong. 1st Sess.

139 Cong Rec S 5677

REFERENCE: Vol. 139 No. 63

TITLE: NATIONAL VOTER REGISTRATION ACT OF 1993 -- CONFERENCE REPORT

SPEAKER: Mr. BOND; Mrs. BOXER; Mr. DASCHLE; Mr. DOLE; Mr. FORD; Mr. GRAMM; Mr. HATFIELD; Mr. McCONNELL; Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN; Mr. NICKLES; Mr. ROTH; Mr. SIMPSON; Mr. STEVENS; Mr. WELLSTONE

TEXT:

[*S5677] The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will now resume consideration of the conference report accompanying H.R. 2, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Conference report to accompany H.R. 2, an act to establish national voter registration procedures for Federal elections and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the conference report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, while we now have the conference report on the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 before us, I would like to point out to the Chair, and for that matter to people in the country, that we have been working on this piece of legislation for 2 years. I believe for certain a significant majority of the Senate, certainly Democrats, and I hope some Republicans as well, are ready to vote.

If there is an operational definition of gridlock, then I think this is the definition: 2 years of work, legislation that is good Government legislation, a bill that enables Americans to register and vote, reaches out, makes sure that we have some kind of uniform standard, strong focus on motor-voter and some agency-based registration, modeled after a number of different States, including the State of Wisconsin and my State of Minnesota, with hardly really any debate about it around the country and many, many positive editorials.

I think that Senator Ford, the distinguished whip, has received a great deal of respect for his work on this piece of legislation, and Senator Hatfield, from Oregon. They have taken a

[*S5678] bipartisan approach. Other Senators have been very interested. There is a broad coalition of good Government, civil rights -- you name it -- league of women voters organizations, all have endorsed this piece of legislation. We are still waiting.

Now, my impression is that there will be some other Senators who want to speak. Presumably, the Republicans will be out on the floor. But this is the true definition of gridlock: 2 years of work and we now have the conference report. We still do not have a time agreement. We could vote on this piece of legislation today, and we should vote on this piece of legislation today.

I would call it a political game. That is what it is. Frankly, I think those who continue to engage in this kind of obstructionism are playing a dangerous game because pretty soon people in the country are going to catch on that whether or not it is the economy and jobs, or whether it is voter registration or campaign finance reform, it is going to be back on the floor of the Senate. And then eventually we are going to have health care. Over and over and over again, I fear, Mr. President, we are going to see the same pattern. Here we are, Friday morning. I do not see anybody on the floor. We have the conference report. We are ready to vote on it; 2 years of work; broad base of support.

This legislation says that we are going to make sure that we reach out and play a positive, affirmative role -- motor-voter, agency-based registration -- to make it easier for citizens to register and vote. That is called democracy.

I cannot for the life of me even figure out what the opposition is. We have heard all of these arguments. We have debated and debated and debated and debated and debated. I do not know, how many cloture votes have we had? Seven cloture votes. Seven cloture votes, last Congress and this Congress. Seven cloture votes. It went to the House of Representatives. There was hard work in the conference committee. Senators and Representatives, Democrats and Republicans thrashed out the conference report, hard negotiations, bring it back to the floor of the Senate, and here we are again.

We are ready to vote. I do not think there is anything else I can say, and I do not see anybody else present to talk, so I think at this point in time I will suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be able to speak as if in morning business.

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

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Daschle] is recognized.

Mr. DASCHLE. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. Daschle pertaining to the introduction of S. 923 are located in today's Record under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolution.")

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

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I intend to continue to oppose this bill. This legislation is just another example of a Washington mandate for which States and taxpayers are called upon to pick up the tab. Let us look at my State, for instance. Alaska has 81.2 percent of its eligible population registered to vote. That is one of the highest rates in the country. Over 66 percent of our eligible voters voted in the last election.

Despite that excellent record, this bill will require us to pay for the federally mandated bureaucracy that is created under this conference report.

Two of our Governors, one a Democrat, one an Independent, Cowper and Hickel, have written to the Senate to oppose this proposal.

They have estimated the cost of this measure to be the equivalent of a 28-percent increase in Alaska's election division. This is coming upon our State at a time when our State income is being reduced. We are having to reduce all sorts of support, even for education, throughout our State.

This bill calls upon us to increase by nearly one-half million dollars a year the money we spend on election procedures despite the fact, as I said, we have one of the highest registration levels in the country already. This will cost us about \$12 for each new voter registrant despite the fact that today the cost for our State is \$4.50 for each one.

Our registration at \$4.50 is a success. And one has to ask why should the taxpayers of Alaska spend more money to register fewer people? That is what will happen under this, we believe. Alaska already has the three forms of registration that is called for by this legislation, but we do not have the bureaucratic redtape that this report will impose upon every State. That is where Washington's mandating State procedures is going to cost State taxpayers more money. None of the increased cost to my State will be borne by the Federal taxpayers. This is the Federal Government mandating costs that will be imposed upon State taxpayers.

We believe that, although Alaska's costs will go up, voter turnout will not. Those who have supported this bill say there is nothing in it which will guarantee an increased turnout. I ask the Senate to read the conference report.

The proposal will end two of Alaska's precautions that are designed to protect our ballot process. Our current Alaska law requires that two witnesses sign all postcard registration forms that are sent through the mail. One of our Governors wrote to me that this requirement is needed to heighten the registrants' awareness of the serious nature of our voting laws. Under this proposal, the simple precaution requiring that two witnesses sign the postcard registration form will be banned. We see no reason for the Federal Government to mandate change in our State law that is a precaution for our very modern up-to-date postcard registration concept.

We use these postcard registrations because of the great distances between our voters within our State, probably the greatest distance of any State in the Union. Our State is one-fifth the size of the whole United States. We have to have a voter registration system designed to meet our needs. Yet, this bill says we are to use a system that is designed to meet the needs of downtown New York, Chicago, or Los Angeles.

We also require out-of-State voter registration applicants to provide some identification or other documentation that supports their claim to Alaska residency. This provision does help prevent non-Alaskans from obtaining Alaska benefits by mailing phony voter registration applications from outside the State. We do provide benefits to some Alaskans who are temporarily residing out of the State, but this will enable non-Alaskans to try to obtain those benefits by registering to vote even though they have no intention to vote, because that is one of the things that is listed on the application for benefits.

This legislation before us now, this conference report, incredibly, bans this Alaskan precaution to protect us against false claims for benefits under other laws.

In addition, the legislation will require all welfare employees to become actively involved in the administration of our elections. During the hearings, we found the St. Louis Post Dispatch had detailed allegations that welfare employees were registering welfare applicants for one party only and telling them who to vote for. Apparently there is evidence that they drove the welfare applicants to the polls. Those people were supposed to be in the office helping welfare applicants, but they were out driving people to the polls to vote. This legislation requires a link between welfare and the election process in every welfare office throughout our Nation. We believe it is likely to result in more political manipulation of those in need of public assistance and, even

[*S5679] without that threat of actual manipulation, the report creates the appearance that public assistance is linked to participation in the political system, and as the Dispatch shows, to participation in one party as opposed to the openness of our election system. I believe it violates the American tradition of voluntary political participation, and it is a very bad idea for us to start linking benefits under a system such as the welfare system to actual participation in the political process under the supervision of the people who are hired to administer the welfare system.

There is another cost for the taxpayers in this bill. The legislation that is envisioned by this conference report gives standing to sue States in Federal court to advocacy groups for any alleged failure to implement the bill as interpreted by those advocacy groups. Any State that does not spend the money that the advocacy group believes ought to be spent or a State that might make an honest mistake in implementing the mandates of this bill will face costly Federal court litigation because of these advocacy groups.

And there should be no doubt about the willingness of some of these advocacy groups to sue under the act. One of the advocacy groups -- and this is in our committee report -- that pushed this bill made this statement:

The prudent approach (or so it seems to us) is to support the passage of th(is) bill and then litigate if States fail to implement (it) ***.

And by that it means obviously implementing it the way the advocacy group wants it interpreted.

I do not happen to think the answer to low voter turnout is to unleash a torrent of Federal lawsuits against States. Our elections are supposed to be according to State law, and we see no reason for the Federal Government to be mandating changes in State law, particularly in States like mine which has had some of the highest turnout and registration rates in the country.

Forcing us to register people who are not eligible to vote, who have no intention to vote, but who seek other benefits from our State, will result in a decline in our turnout rates because of the number of people that will be registered under this system whom we cannot purge from the list of those who are eligible.

I again think that the Senate ought to reject this conference report. It does seem to me that those States such as ours that already have the laws that this bill seeks to impose upon States should have been exempt and some recognition should have been given to the conditions in each State. State laws must deal with situations such as the great distances between our voting precincts and the inability of some of our people to actually come in and register in person. We have created a mail registration system that is better than any in the country, and yet our system is going to be affected. We must now change our State law to comply with a mandate in this Federal law, and we must do it in a way that will increase costs to our taxpayers more than 100 percent. The cost of registering voters will go from \$4.50 to \$12 per voter under this mandate, according to voter registration people in my State.

I urge the Senate to reject this conference report. I have done that before; we proposed it before. I can see what is coming here, but I think it is just wrong. This is another example of a Federal mandate that creates State costs and forces States to change their laws and then exposes States to litigation from national advocacy groups if they try to resist this pressure from Washington to interfere in the election process of each State. I hope that the Senate will listen to us who oppose this bill and defeat it.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Illinois.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Thank you, Mr. President.

I have spoken before in behalf of the motor-voter legislation and I speak now in behalf of it and in support of the conference report.

I want to point out to the public and to the Members of this body that it is not unusual to have Federal mandates in regards to the exercise of voting rights in this country.

Indeed, Mr. President, the 19th amendment, which was passed in 1920 -- which, of course, gave women the right to vote -- imposed on many States that did not allow feminine participation in the election franchise, imposed on those States a requirement that women be treated as equal citizens and given the right to vote. There were many States at the time the 19th amendment was passed that already allowed women to vote, but at the same time not all States did. And, as a function of the constitutional amendment, it was determined that it was a fundamental right of citizenship that should not be determined based on gender. And so the franchise was universally extended throughout the United States.

I submit to you, Mr. President, the motor-voter provision that this conference committee report represents is in keeping with that tradition. It simply calls on the States to enact a simplified procedure, a uniform set of procedures that will allow individuals to exercise the franchise to vote, whether they live in Iowa, or Minnesota, or Illinois, or Alaska, or Florida, or Texas, or California, or wherever in these United States they may reside.

We are, as you know, Mr. President, an increasingly mobile population. People move from State to State. One of the things that people who do move and who change residences, even sometimes within a State, run into most often are situations in which, by virtue of their mobility, their franchise is taken away from them; by virtue of moving, they get from one location to another and discover there is a new set of barriers, a new set of voting hurdles, or that the election comes upon them 3 days after moving day.

Mr. President, if you have ever been involved in moving your residence, you know how much of a time hassle that can be. But they get to a new residence and discover the election is coming up in a month and there is not time for them to go through the different barriers and hurdles to establish their residence so they can register to vote.

Motor-voter simply says, essentially -- and I know there have been plenty of discussions that, First, there should be consistency, so it would not matter whether you lived in Texas or Iowa, that you could go to a uniform set of governmental offices -- this is not just throwing it open to anybody -- a set of governmental offices to exercise your right to become qualified to vote.

By removing institutional barriers across this country to participation, we hope -- but it is not necessarily to be seen -- we hope that that will increase participation.

We are right now in this country at about 50, 55 percent, in terms of voter participation. Surely, we would want to get up higher. We would want to get up to the 100 percent if it is possible, because if there is one single set of rights that we have that we ought to respect and be responsible for it is the exercise of the franchise. It is a fundamental, defining right of our constitutional democracy.

So we would want to get people up to 100 percent participation. But failing that, we would want to see, in any election, a representative number of the community coming to the polls and voting. We are now at 55 percent.

We hope to expand the franchise so we can expand participation. It is not guaranteed that we will expand participation, but certainly, to the extent there are institutional barriers to participation, those barriers should come down. And that is what motor-voter does.

In terms of expanding the franchise, though, I have listened to some of the debate against this conference report and I am struck by all the arguments that really just kind of tiptoe around the notion that somehow the enactment of this legislation will create a partisan advantage for one party versus another.

I have to tell you, Mr. President, after having listened to all of the beating of the breast and gnashing of the teeth about who is going to get a partisan advantage, I am really beginning to reach the conclusion that perhaps -- perhaps -- there really is a fear of participation; there really is a fear that the American people will come out and express their views at the polls; there really is a fear that we will remove the barriers: If we remove the barriers the gauntlet will come down and we will really have a democracy. That is really what I believe the arguments against

[*S5680] this conference report can be reduced to -- reduced to fear.

I think we should look at it in terms of what are our hopes. Our hopes are that people will participate. Our hopes are that we will expand the franchise.

And whether it turns out that there is a partisan advantage for one party or the other party is something we are willing to take a risk on. We are willing to take a risk that our democracy might work a little better. And that is why we want to have motor-voter. We are willing to take a risk.

It could be, Mr. President, that enhanced registration opportunities will give a partisan advantage to the other side of the aisle. Well, I am willing to take that risk. I am willing to take that risk, because the essence of our democracy is that the individuals who stand for public office and the parties will make their case to the American people and it will be up to the people to decide by whom and how this country will be governed.

That is what motor-voter is calculated to enhance -- to remove institutional barriers, so that participation can be enhanced, so that our democracy will work a little better.

I do not have a problem, Mr. President, with the notion that in one State or another it will require some revision. Any Federal lawmaking requires some revision. And I do not have a problem with the notion that States can be sued. Well, if a State violates Federal law, of course they can be sued, and there is a host of laws on the books toward that end.

I come out of an experience in State and local government. I served in my State legislature in Illinois for a number of years and then in county government, so I am very familiar and very sensitive to the whole issue of State and local governments and what they can and cannot do.

I feel confident, Mr. President, that the State and local governments will be able to quickly adjust to the provisions of motor-voter. In fact, if anything, for many, if not most of them, this legislation will simplify and will clarify voting procedures in a way that will provide cost savings.

Now, I am fully aware that the CBO report says that there will be costs, and there will be costs passed on to State and local governments as a result of this legislation. But I daresay, Mr. President, that by accepting the costs, limited as they are in the first years of implementation, those costs will be not only absorbed over time but also will be offset by the increased activity, by the increased participation, and indeed by the simplification that will inure to the benefit and to the savings at the State and local level down the road, 2 or 3 years down the road.

The legislation does not go into effect until 1995. So there is a time already in place for State and local governments to adjust their procedures, to work on procedures. And quite frankly, a lot of the procedures, the barebones at least, are set out already.

So I dare say that while we are very concerned about the issue of mandates -- and I certainly am; I even have legislation, Mr. President, on the issue of unpaid for mandates by the Federal Government -- I do not think it is right that we should legislate and not pay for things and not tell the States what is it going to cost.

The difference with motor-voter is that the answers and the cost estimates are right up front. The direct cost of this bill is less than \$20 million nationwide. That is for everybody across the country.

Well, that \$20 million will be more than offset. The State and local governments know up front -- before the fact and not after the fact -- what the costs are estimated to be. They have plenty of time to make the adjustment.

And so I dare say, Mr. President, that some of the objections that we are hearing to this legislation really reflect more a partisan fear than hope for our democracy and hope to expand our franchise.

With that, Mr. President, I note the absence of a quorum.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, as is apparent, I am just in the final stages, I hope, of pollen-induced laryngitis. But I am going to make some observations with regard to the bill that is before us. Unfortunately, this bill has moved a lot further than I had hoped. I still have great hope that it will not become law, but it is getting very close.

Mr. President, it seems to me that you can just slap a reform label on a bill, get a few groups to form a coalition behind it and it becomes a runaway freight train. Perception takes over from reality.

A couple of examples.

Campaign finance reform. The reality is that there is no collective money chase. Senators do not raise thousands of dollars week-in/week-out for 6 years. In the last three elections, Senators raised 80 percent of their reelection funds in the last 2 years of their 6-year terms. And the reality is that those who raised the most had the most competitive situations.

But the new political reality is that reality does not matter. Perception matters. So this body is going to seriously consider a taxpayer-funded spending limits scheme that in reality will not limit total campaign spending, special interests, or incumbent advantages. In reality, the President's bill will not clean up the process, but will force campaign spending into undisclosed, unlimited channels like nonparty soft money and independent expenditures.

The reality is that spending limits are bad. The perception is that spending limits are good. Common Cause says so. The New York Times says so. The reality is just the opposite.

David Broder, who I think we would all agree is the most -- sort of the premier political commentator of our age, had an interesting column in the Sunday Post a couple of weeks ago about not only campaign finance, but some of the other reform issues that have been bandied about, and taken seriously -- and in the case of motor voter, almost passed.

Broder said in his piece:

From coast to coast an army of reformers, waiving the banner of populist protest against the special interests, is mobilizing to enact a host of remedies for the ills of American democracy.

Term-limits, campaign finance reform and curbs on lobbying in particular are gathering support as cures for a system the reformers say is overrun with careerism, insider influence and financial corruption. If enacted, their remedies would without doubt change the nature of the American republic: The structure and operations of government would be recast and power would be substantially redistributed.

Yet paradoxically, the "populist" reforms, many of which are pushed by "good government" groups like Common Cause and the League of Women Voters, have a common characteristic: They would all increase the power of the economic and social elite that most vociferously advocates them. And they might well reduce the influence of the mass voters in whose name they are being urged.

Broder proceeds:

One would expect that such sweeping changes would occasion great debate. But in many of the major marketplaces of ideas -- TV talk shows and commentaries -- the "debate" is remarkably one-sided. The reformers are the good guys holding the high ground against the hacks, crooks and influence-peddlers. Who wants to defend perks and privileges, political action committees and the brigade of Gucci-shod lobbyists?

As Perot told me in an interview last month, "If there's someone out there who thinks our future would look better if we had MORE foreign lobbyists, let'em speak up."

I'm not foolhardy enough to accept Perot's dare, but I do want to argue that the missing side of this debate needs to be heard, not because the reformers are entirely wrong in their criticisms -- they are not -- but because they have an agenda that is not as innocuous or disinterested as they pretend.

Reformers couch their proposals in terms of eliminating pernicious influences on politics and government, but they rarely acknowledge that the process changes they push would also redistribute power -- in the direction of themselves and their social-economic peers. What they would do with this power remains unclear from their manifestos. But historically, regimes that have been dominated by social and economic elites frequently have failed to respond to the needs of the lower classes. Often, they have seeded true people's movements that have taken an ugly turn.

Further in the article Broder said:

Though today's reformers have appropriated the rhetoric of "temple guardians," their preferred remedies for "cleaning" the system are remarkably similar to actions

[*S5681] that would enhance their own power and influence.

That is exactly what is going on here, not only with campaign finance reform but with motor-voter as well.

With regard to motor-voter, the reality is that turnout increased 5 percent last year. Why? Because there were a lot of competitive campaigns last year which, interestingly, spent a lot of money. Increased campaign spending was both a cause and a symptom of that increased competition.

The reality is that voting is not all that hard in any State in this country. The reality is that 30 States already have mail registration. Nearly 30 States already have some form of motor-voter registration. And 10 States already have agency-based registration. The reality is that States already are making a concerted effort to devise voter registration systems to serve their citizens within the constraints of their budgets and with regard for their particular histories of voter fraud.

The reality is that people who do not vote, choose not to vote for a lot of reasons. Registration laws are not blocking them from voting.

Despite the well-organized efforts of the proponents of this bill, most people do not have any problem with allowing States to regulate their own voter registration systems. But the perception created by editorial boards and an interest group coalition is that Congress needs to mandate all three registration systems -- motor-voter, mail, and agency-based - in all 50 States. And the perception they are trying to create is that anyone who stands in the way of the motor-voter bill is a scoundrel who for some reason does not want people to vote.

These days, reality and perception are on two different tracks in Congress, and only perception is being dealt with.

Mr. President, far away from here, among the American people, reality and perception have collided. The perception has long been that Government is out of control and that we are not dealing with the real problems facing this country. The reality is that Government is out of control and we are not dealing with the real problems facing this country.

Thus, we have a \$5 trillion debt. Thus, Americans are overtaxed and underserved. Government is bloated and inefficient. Thus, we have just spent weeks on an unnecessary, unfunded mandate on States reeling under their own budget problems. This is literally a waste of time when you consider the issues really confronting this country.

And, we will spend weeks on a taxpayer-funded campaign finance bill that has the appearance of doing something about perceived problems with little or no basis in reality. Should it pass, it will be hailed as an accomplishment simply because it passed Congress and was signed into law by the President. But what would have actually been accomplished for the country? Absolutely nothing. All that would have been accomplished is the creation of a new entitlement program with politicians as the direct beneficiaries -- and special interests as indirect beneficiaries through the enhanced power they will exercise through soft money and independent expenditures.

The bill before us, motor-voter, has been blown up all out of proportion. It will throw a whole lot of people onto the registration rolls, at considerable expense to States and possibly to the integrity of the electoral process. And for what? People thrust onto the rolls are not going to roll off the sofa on election day just because this bill made registration easier.

Mr. President, I am not concerned that the Republican Party will somehow be hurt because of increased turnout resulting from this bill. Generally in recent years my party has benefited from high turnout. In any event, turnout is not going to increase because of throwing thousands of people onto the voting rolls. It will have no impact at all.

Turnout may increase because people become so enraged at this Congress' failure to devise real solutions to real problems that they take matters into their own hands by voting incumbents out of office. Since there are far more Democrat incumbents than Republican incumbents and since Democrats control the entire Federal Government, such increased turnout could actually help the Republican Party. If enough voters would reflect on the fact that the Democratic Party has controlled Congress for most of the last 40 years, then increased turnout would really help Republicans.

The only people who really are going to be hurt by this bill are the taxpayers, as usual. They are hurting so much already under this administration, they may be numb to any more pain.

Although the prospect of this bill passing is appalling to me, Republicans did make it a better bill than it was originally. The core package of amendments that 41 Republicans insisted be adopted before it could pass the Senate survived conference largely intact.

Republicans slammed the escape-hatch shut. No longer is this bill a backdoor means of forcing States into adopting election day registration or no registration whatsoever. Under the original bill, any State that could not afford to comply with the onerous and expensive mandates would be exempted from the bill altogether -- if they adopted election day registration or no registration. Republicans succeeded in grandfathering in the five States that would have qualified for the exemption prior to March 11, 1993. Whatever the intentions of the original escape-hatch provision may have been, the effect would have been to push States into adopting extremely liberal registration systems that they otherwise would not adopt.

As the core package was being negotiated in conference, I was contacted by the secretaries of state of Michigan and South Dakota, both of whom wanted the escape hatch option left open. Officials in Illinois also urged that they be allowed to opt out through election day registration. These State officials wanted the escape hatch because their States cannot afford the unfunded mandates in this bill. They want flexibility.

Mr. President, I sympathize with these officials in Michigan, South Dakota, and Illinois. I fought to preserve their flexibility by opposing this unfunded mandate bill in the first place. Only one of the six Senators from those States, Senator Pressler of South Dakota, joined me in this effort to preserve States rights and flexibility. I regret that we did not prevail and these States must now contend with these unfunded mandates. It was certainly not my plan that they get the privilege to pay for. However, their constituents are better served by the closing of the escape hatch than if it had been left open.

Republicans also improved the agency-based registration provision. Under the original legislation, States would have been required to register voters as they receive assistance at welfare, disability services, and unemployment offices. Under the Republican core package amendment, States still would have been required to provide agency-based registration, but the makeup of those agencies would have been left up to the States to determine. Unfortunately, the Republican position did not prevail on this point. Although unemployment offices still will be optional, welfare and all public assistance offices are once again required to register voters.

While the intent may have been admirable in bringing low- or no-income citizens into the political process, the effect will be to put these citizens in a precarious position.

Citizens who rely on Government checks to eat, pay the rent, and feed their children are particularly vulnerable to intimidation, be it overt or implicit. A social service worker with a check in one hand and a voter registration form in the other? Yes, that will be intimidating. It will be at least as intimidating for these citizens as it would be for taxpayers being registered to vote by an Internal Revenue Service auditor.

Mr. President, at this point I would like to read from a letter the conferees received on April 2, from the County Welfare Directors Association of California:

The County Welfare Directors Association of California urges you to accept the Senate's provision to the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (H.R. 2 and S. 460) which would make agency-based registration optional. We support the principle of maximizing voter registration, however, county welfare offices simply do not have the resources to carry out an additional unfunded mandate. The already overburdened system and

[*S5682] programs we administer are based on a number of complex and cumbersome asset and income calculations and verifications imposed by Congress and the courts. These new requirements would divert scarce resources from the clients and the mission we exist to serve.

The letter goes on to say:

Moreover, we are also concerned that the integrity of our agencies may be compromised in the eyes of our clients. There does seem to be something implicitly coercive about the process involved. Many of our clients are poorly educated and have little trust in the system. They are likely to feel they must register or they must vote in order to receive benefits and that somehow this would ultimately affect their benefits.

Five other Republican core package provisions were adopted in varying degrees: First, unsigned applications will serve as a declination; second, undeliverable registration notices will trigger the bill's purge provisions; third, States will be allowed to require that registrants who do not notify officials of a change of address within a jurisdiction could vote at only the new or only the old precinct; fourth, registration forms will stipulate voter eligibility requirements and penalties for fraud; fifth, agency based registrants will be allowed to refuse assistance.

Senator McCain's amendment to ensure that our Nation's service men and women are brought into the process through registration at military recruitment offices has been retained. No one has a greater stake in our Nation's electoral process than our soldiers whose very lives may hinge on the decisions of elected officials.

In addition to these, Senator Durenberger drafted additional language to address the coercion problem inherent in agency based registration. While I think the bill is better with this language than without it, I am not satisfied that the potential for coercion has been alleviated.

Mr. President, another important Republican amendment that was included in the Senate version of the bill, courtesy of Senator Simpson, was dropped in conference. Senator Simpson's amendment simply would have clarified that States could require proof of citizenship to register to vote. It is curious, to say the least, that this provision was dumped by Democrats on the conference committee.

This bill is better thanks to the efforts and resolve of Republican Senators who stood firm and insisted on these amendments in the face of baseless charges of gridlock.

However, Mr. President, Congress still has not paid for the motor-voter bill. It still is an unfunded mandate. It still is a solution in search of a problem. It still should be defeated.

I yield the floor.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Leahy). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas asks unanimous consent that the quorum call be dispensed with, and it is granted.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, along with the saxophones and McDonald's hamburgers, the newest rage in Washington seems to be the unfunded mandate.

Earlier this year, Congress passed a family leave bill costing businesses hundreds of millions of dollars.

In March, Congress rammed through an unemployment compensation bill raising the deficit by \$6 billion but did not offer a single way to pay for it.

Last month, the Senate debated the so-called stimulus package, highlighting the fundamental differences between the two parties. Democrats voted to increase the deficit with \$19 billion of additional Federal spending. Republicans prefer to cut spending and pay for any spending increases with spending cuts elsewhere.

And now, Mr. President, we have the motor-voter mandate. We seem to think we can come up with any idea, no matter how expensive, no matter whether anybody is for it, just pass it, charge it on the credit card, charge it to somebody, and that is what we are doing with this bill in cash-strapped States and localities.

NO FREE RIDE WITH MOTOR-VOTER

Mr. President, with a \$4 trillion national debt, we have learned the hard way there is no such thing as a free lunch. And today there is certainly no free ride with motor-voter; 10 States, including my home State of Kansas, have estimated that complying with the motor-voter mandates will cost them more than \$87 million. That is not a lot of money around here, but \$87 million, we say, "Oh, well, don't worry about \$87 million, it could be \$87 billion." Well, it is \$87 million. The total cost for all 50 States would obviously be much higher.

So it is no wonder that the National Governors' Association -- that is Democrats and Republicans -- the National Association of Counties, the National Association of Towns and Townships, the National League of Cities, and hundreds of State and local officials throughout the country have all registered their opposition to this bill.

It seems to me, if we fund it, that is one thing. In fact, we offered an amendment to fund it. It was defeated. Here there is a feeling we should not pay for anything; just pass it. Do not worry about paying for it. That is too tough. Pass it. Let somebody else worry about paying for it: Cities, States, employers, workers. How are they going to do it? Are they going to cut their education budget, their child nutrition programs, or just raise taxes?

THE NICKLES-DOLE AMENDMENT

Last March, I joined my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma, Senator Nickles, in offering an amendment that would have allowed each State to estimate the additional costs associated with motor-voter requirements and to submit this estimate to the Senate Rules Committee and the House Administration Committee.

The amendment would have delayed the effective date of these requirements until Congress appropriated funds to defray the additional costs.

The amendment was simple and straightforward, an honest attempt to restore some accountability by forcing Congress to pick up the motor-voter tab.

Unfortunately, the amendment was defeated, and now I would say this. We have the conference report before us now. It is an improvement, but it is still out of gas and ought to be left parked wherever it is.

No doubt about it, it is an improvement over the original Senate and House bills, and because of the hard work of my distinguished colleague from Kentucky, Senator McConnell, the conference report closes the so-called election day escape hatch. This loophole would have encouraged States to adopt same-day registration procedures as a means of escaping the bill's requirements. In many areas same-day registration is a prescription for fraud and corruption.

The conference report also allows but does not require registration at unemployment offices, and it prohibits workers at welfare offices from influencing registration decisions of welfare recipients, though registration at these offices continues to be mandatory. It is not mandatory anywhere else as far as I know.

I wish to thank our colleague from Minnesota, Senator Durenberger, for helping us make those changes.

Mr. President, these changes are steps in the right direction, but in the final analysis the conference report is still not acceptable to this Senator. It may be to a majority. I assume it will be to the majority.

BEST WAY TO INCREASE VOTER TURNOUT

Mr. President, no one is against increasing voter registration. The more people who vote I guess is better for democracy.

In 1992, I am pleased to report that Kansans turned out to vote in record numbers; 75 percent of the voting-age population was in fact registered to vote and 85 percent of those who were registered actually voted. This 85 percent participation rate represents a 14-percent increase over the previous turnout record.

What these numbers prove is that motor-voter participation has little to do with the Nation's secretaries of state and county clerks who supposedly have not made it easy enough for people to vote, as this bill's proponents would contend.

People will take time to vote if they believe they have a stake in an election. And they will vote if they are convinced that Congress is a credible institution, that we can conduct our affairs responsibly and without gimmicks.

Unfortunately, the motor-voter bill flunks the credibility test.

[*S5683]

With its credit card approach to voter registration, this legislation proves that Congress is ready, willing, and able to bask in all the hype but a deadbeat when it comes time to pay the bill. It seems to me that by any measure the motor-voter bill is a money-guzzling clunker. It belongs in the congressional junkyard.

I must say, I go home a lot. Never will anybody ask me about the motor-voter bill, nobody in elected office, not my Democratic Governor. Nobody urged me to vote for it. Nobody, urged me to vote for it. Nobody, wherever I go, ever heard of the motor-voter legislation. But I think some of the Governors know and some of the other people know that somebody has to pick up the tab. And despite all the good intentions -- I am certain the proponents of the bill have nothing but good intentions. I am not questioning that, but again it is another federally unfunded mandate.

And you go to the League of Cities, you go to the county officials meetings, you go to the township meetings, you go to the Governors conference, they are all up there talking about unfunded mandates, but we just insist on giving them unfunded mandates, and there are more coming.

We figured out something in Congress. We are broke, States are in bad shape, cities are in bad shape. So what are we doing now? We are sending unfunded mandates to employers. We found a few people still making it in America. We are going to try to do them in in the next decade.

But here we are just adding to the burden that States and cities and others already have. Somebody can dispute the figures, as I assume they will. But what is \$1 million? If the thing only costs \$1 million, why send out an unfunded mandate -- if it only costs \$5. If we are going to ask people to do something and direct them to do it on the Federal level, then we ought to pay for it.

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

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

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, we have before us a bill that is titled the "National Voter Registration Act of 1993." It is also called, by its proponents, the motor-voter bill.

I would like to discuss this bill today and explain why I am opposed to it, and why I do not think it represents the kind of issue that we should be debating here in the Congress.

Mr. President, traditionally voter registration has been left up to the States. Previous Federal intervention on voter registration issues has basically been an intervention to assure that anybody who was eligible to vote was guaranteed the right to register and to vote.

This intervention has been based, on the constitutional issue of guaranteeing equal access to the ballot.

Other than that major intervention, which was vitally important to make American democracy work, the Federal position has been that the individual States should establish, voter registration guidelines within the general proposition that such procedures have to conform to the constitutional guarantees that our citizens have.

The stated objective of this bill, if you listen to the debate, is to try to increase voter turnout through a provision called the motor-voter provision. In fact, the whole bill is called the motor-voter bill. But, Mr. President, that is a misnomer for this bill. The idea behind the bill is to have it so that if anybody -- or at least in the discussion of the motor-voter section -- the idea behind it is to have it so that anybody who gets a driver's license is automatically registered to vote.

Clearly, the proponents of this bill believe that despite the fact that States have gone to mail-in registration, despite the fact that States have gone to great lengths to make it easier for people to vote, despite the fact that in my State, we have an extended period of no-excuse absentee balloting, that somehow we need to make it easier for people to get registered to vote.

So the argument of this bill is: Let us just have a neutral registration process where if people get a driver's license, they are registered to vote.

There are problems with that in that it is very common in my part of the country for illegal aliens to have driver's licenses. It is also very difficult, if you do that, unless periodically you go back and purge the voter rolls, to keep the rolls current. It is not an unheard-of phenomenon in this country for dozens of people to vote who are registered and whose address turns out to be a vacant lot; these are not homeless people.

But, Mr. President, if all this bill contained was the motor-voter provision, then I would vote for it. I would be willing to say that is a reasonable compromise. I do not think the Federal Government ought to be mandating to the States how they go about voter registration but as long as they were not discriminating against anybody, I wouldn't object.

If there is one thing that State governments agree on; it is that they are tired of Federal mandates. When we tell them how to do things, we are imposing costs on them and we are not paying for it. But given where we are on this issue, if motor-voter was the only issue, I would not see it as being very important because it is a fairly neutral process for a person to get a driver's license.

It is also probably true that in registering people to vote at the time they obtain their driver's license, that while you do open the potential for voter fraud, the impact on registration on a partisan basis is probably insignificant.

But, Mr. President, I do not believe that is what this bill is about. I do not believe this bill is really about motor-voter. I think this bill is really an effort to mandate costs on the States, to dictate policy to the States, and to try to change the partisan mix of American elections.

Mr. President, let me just take an example -- and I think it is a relevant example; it is the major reason -- despite the fact that I am not for mandates, that I am not for the Federal Government telling the States how to do their jobs, let me just give you one insight that I think any objective person will see as an effort to try to tilt the political persons.

Under this bill, each State shall -- that is, must -- designate agencies for the registration of voters in elections for Federal office; each State shall designate as voter registration agencies all offices in the State that provide public assistance.

In other words, under this bill, at the courthouse in my county, you go to a specific office to register to vote. But under this bill, not only can you register to vote at the county clerk's office in the courthouse, but if you go to get assistance, to get welfare, to get aid to families with dependent children, to get benefits from the Government, that office, too, must register people to vote.

Mr. President, let me point out a distinction which I think is very important. When we debated this, I raised the question to my colleagues on the left: Why are we making the welfare office register people to vote, but we are not making the tax office register people to vote? What is the difference between people who are riding in the wagon, and people who are pulling the wagon? Why is it that the majority is so interested in registering people on welfare to vote, but is so indifferent about registering people who are paying taxes to vote?

I noticed, in a little rhetorical sop here in this conference report, that the bill now says that the areas designated for voter registration "may" include government revenue offices. Why "must" on the welfare office; why "may" on the government revenue office?

Well, Mr. President, as we all know, under current law, the State can designate voter registration wherever it wants to designate it. As we know today, in all 50 States and the District of Columbia, States can designate registration sites in the tax office, in the welfare office, in the gun registration office, in the driver's license office, wherever they want to. They have a right to do that, and States have increasingly made it easier to register.

But this proposed law says you must register people to vote in the welfare office.

It would seem to me that what is clearly contemplated here is that when people come in to get their welfare check, they are going to be pressured to register to vote; that the voter registration material is there. It is going to be given to them. And I do not think there is any doubt about the fact that the clear intention of this bill is to tilt the electoral process by not mandating the registration of taxpayers, but by mandating that the welfare office be a registration center.

Mr. President, with all of the problems in American democracy, with all of the very real issues we face, why are we here debating a bill which is aimed simply at distorting the outcome of elections by forcing welfare office in the registration to vote, but not forcing it in the tax office?

In fact, the only justification for this bill is not that we do not believe that States and counties have sense enough to register people to vote, it is not that we believe that they are in any way being unfair in registering people to vote; the

whole purpose of this bill is that the majority wants to mandate that the welfare office register people to vote. That is what the whole debate is about. And the whole debate is an effort to try to change voter turnout.

It seems to me that our Democratic colleagues believe that they have a comparative advantage in appealing to the people who are riding in the wagon, and that Republicans have a comparative advantage in appealing to people who are pulling the wagon. I think that is correct. I do not think there is any doubt about that. I think every poll I have ever seen shows that.

It seems to me that one thing we ought to be is neutral in the process. If our Democratic colleagues can induce people who are using the welfare office to turn out and vote, that is how the process works. If we can induce people who are going to the tax office and paying more taxes to turn out and vote, that is how the process works. But I do not believe that we ought to be legislating, mandating that our county governments and our State governments force registration through the welfare office and not through the tax office. It seems to be that that goes one step beyond simply trying to get people to register to vote and to participate in the democratic process.

So, Mr. President, I am opposed to this bill. As we all said when we passed the bill in the Senate -- and when we passed the bill, it did not have the mandate for welfare office registration in it, we simply left it neutral there -- the local government could register people in the welfare office if it wanted to, and or in the tax office if it wanted to.

Local governments and State governments have said they do not want these mandates. But what has happened now that the bill has come back from the conference committee is that the bill is basically the way it was before we forced the changes in the Senate, and the major provision in the bill is that the bill mandates that the welfare office have voter registration. I think that is a mistake. I think it is something we should not be doing, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. FORD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. Boxer).

Mr. FORD. Madam President, we have heard the same old tactic here this morning, the tactic of fear -- fear of the welfare, fear of those who are not socially high on the income ladder, and that they do not want them to vote. That is playing on the fears rather than the hopes of Americans. And welfare, welfare, welfare office -- that is all we have heard for the last 10 minutes. They are fearful of the disadvantaged in this country, saying they should not have an opportunity to register to vote.

We took our conference and looked at Minnesota and Pennsylvania. I think that we have used those two States in crafting this bill out of conference; that stops any kind of coercion, that stops any kind of intimidation, as relates to those that go to the welfare office; or the disabled, to give them an opportunity to vote also. Under the motor-voter, as has been referred to this morning, 90 percent of the American people will be registered under this provision. We are talking about 10 percent. But again, we hear them playing on fear rather than the hopes of the American people.

What we are trying to do here is to reconnect the American public with its Government. People should have an easy opportunity to be registered to vote. They think that this is something that is trying to be imposed upon the States. CBO has said we can save money under this procedure because it will be orderly, and I think that is important to remember.

I have heard a lot about the credit card here in the last 100 days or so. They want to cut up the credit card. Well, we have had a credit card for 12 years, and we are \$4 trillion in debt. What kind of credit card do you think we have been running on in this country for the last 12 years?

So let us be very careful about cutting up credit cards. As the Republican leader said a while ago, it is a better America if people turn out to vote. We are trying to have a better America, to reconnect our citizens with Government and give them an opportunity. The Republican leader said a moment ago that they had a record turnout in Kansas of registered voters, not eligible voters. There are a lot of eligible voters that wanted to vote that did not.

What is wrong with giving the American people an opportunity to register and vote if they want to? There is nothing mandatory about registering in a welfare office. There is nothing mandatory about registering in an office for the disabled. If they want to register, they can register to vote. So here again we hear the fear. I was pleased when I heard the Senator from Texas say that as it relates to partisan advantage in this bill, it probably was negligible. So I took that to say that it does not make any difference that there is not one party advantage over another.

I believe that we are on the right track. We hear that Governors are not for it and mayors are not for it. Well, all you have to do is go down the list. How many secretaries of state that handle this provision came and testified? Not many in this Chamber right now were there and listened to the testimony. I was there. I heard the secretaries of state testify in favor of this. I heard clerks that were responsible for this particular area, for registering to vote; I heard them testify in favor of this particular legislation.

Madam President, I have a long list of organizations that are for it. They are not politicians but groups of people. The Catholic Church, for instance, supports this bill. That is not a political entity. We have a lot of associations of just people that are for this legislation.

And where did it start? Where did this legislation start? It started at the grassroots. It is not something some politicians put together and said, "This is good for the country, and we will mandate it." This started at the grassroots.

It has worked its way up to Congress, and now that we find that we have something that the people want and we are trying to get it passed, we find this threat of fear -- worried about the welfare office, worried about the welfare office, playing on our fears instead of our hopes. And we worry about the illegal person that might be coming into this country. We hear a lot about how they are going to register to vote.

In the forms that are being used around the country now, you have to present a birth certificate and you also have to sign subject to perjury "I am an American citizen," with Federal penalties that are important.

So I do not hear all these fears coming from States who now have basically the same thing we have in this particular legislation.

So, Madam President, I think all we are hearing here now is something to try to delay this bill to come to a vote.

I worked hard, I dedicated myself to take the floor amendments that were submitted by the Republicans to this bill, and we passed it out of here. I could not guarantee that we would have all of them in there, but I worked hard. And I fought hard for those floor amendments, and basically those amendments, with some slight change, are in this legislation.

We took out the unemployment office. Nobody said anything about that. It is just the welfare office. These are the most disadvantaged people in this country. You say you are fearful of them being coerced. You are fearful of them being intimidated. Let us play on their hopes rather than their fears.

So I hope we could get to this legislation and that we could do it soon. It will come. One way or other, we are going to pass it. I would hope we would not have this delay, delay, and delay.

The American people understand who is delaying. It is not this side. It is not this side that is delaying this piece of legislation that wants to reconnect the American people with their Government. We want to get on with voting for this and do things for people.

They are playing on the credit card. I heard the Republican leader say the other day we are going to cut up the credit card. Now that you have used it for 12 years, it is about worn out. You might have to get a new one. But cut it up. You have been working on that credit card now for 12 years, and it is about worn out.

We talk about it is going to cost money. We tried on our jobs bill, and we could not pass it. We tried awful hard. We could get 57 votes, but we could not get any others to vote with us on the jobs bill.

Lo and behold, what happened? Not a Member on that side voted against increasing the debt by \$4 billion. And what did we do? We extended the unemployment compensation to those people who were out of work and we increased the deficit by \$4 billion. Not a Republican voted against that. It was unanimous, because it was by unanimous consent. It was all paid for.

Now we find that those who wanted to go to work, who could have gone to work under those highway contracts that could have been awarded in 60 days are not out there. Those summer jobs for the disadvantaged kids in our communities are not out there. There were the community development block grants we heard so much fear about. One community in my State would have received 3,000 jobs on community development. That is a bricklayer. That is a carpenter. That is an electrician. That would have had a rippling effect. They would not be on that \$4 billion that we increased the deficit. They would have been working, and you would have had workfare instead of welfare. That is what was voted out of this Chamber.

Now we are trying to say let us let the American people have a real opportunity to say to those of us who run whether they want us or not, whether they want to have a filibuster around here and obstruction around here. Or are we going to have the ability to do something for the American people?

So, Madam President, I hope we can get on with this and that we can go ahead and pass it.

Let me just give some examples of the organizations that are for this piece of legislation. There is the Leadership League for the Blind of America. They are very strong for this. The American Association of Retired Persons is very strong for this bill; the American Civil Liberties Union; the Council of the Blind; Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees; the American Jewish Congress; the American Nurses Association; and on and on and on; the League of Women Voters; the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; the National Association of Developmental Disability Council; the National Association of Recorders.

So these are just people who are for it, not elected politicians that are against it; elected politicians are against this bill but the people happen to be for it.

I hope somehow some way we can find it in our hearts to let this piece of legislation go forward and that the President can sign it and we can get on about the business of this Chamber.

I yield the floor, Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Madam President, I will try to be brief.

I do not think the source of support for this bill comes from our hearts. Why would we write a bill that mandates that the States have voter registration in the welfare office but does not mandate that the States have voter registration in the tax office? Why would we do that?

In fact, why are we mandating that the States have voter registration in any office outside the county clerks office?

Now, our dear colleague from Kentucky talks about making it easy to vote. Why should it not be easy for the people who work in this country to vote? Why do we only mandate that people at the welfare office be able to register to vote and not the people who are going to the tax office to pay their taxes?

There is only one reason we would do that, and that is someone believes, our Democratic colleagues being the someone, that there is partisan political advantage to them by having registration in a welfare office and not the tax office.

Our colleague said, "I did not seek partisan advantage in the bill." I do not see it in the driver's license registration which I do not oppose.

I do not think we ought to be mandating. I think the States ought to be able to do it if they desire. But if that is all this bill did, I would not have any real objection. But what I do object to is forcing registration in the welfare office but not in the revenue office.

Our colleague talked about illegal aliens. Let me read you from the report of the bill on page 23:

The Senate amendment. The Senate amendment provides that nothing in this act shall prevent a State from requiring presentation of documentation related to citizenship of an applicant for voter registration.

In other words, the Senate bill as we passed it said nothing in this bill could prevent the States from forcing someone to prove that they were in fact a citizen.

Let me read you the next sentence from our conference report, the conference agreement which is the bill before us:

The conferees agree with the House bill and do not include this provision from the Senate amendment.

Then it goes on with a long sentence about the Voting Rights Act.

Mr. FORD. Read the rest of it.

Mr. GRAMM. Madam President, if we do not want illegal aliens voting, why do we not just come out and say so in the bill? Why do we not be specific? Why was that provision dropped?

So, I do not think people are confused. Maybe I am wrong. Maybe this high-sounding rhetoric sounds great. But I think this high-sounding rhetoric dies an instant death when people realize that this passion for voting, this great desire to see that people go and exercise their sacred right, which I believe every citizen should do, but it only extends to the welfare office, that it is only in the welfare office where we feel so passionate about voting that we make voter registration a mandate; we do not feel equally passionate when it comes to the tax office. We do not have our hearts well up for the people who do the work, pay the taxes, and pull the wagon in this country. Only in riding in the wagon do you secure a place in our electoral heart.

Maybe people are deceived by that, but, Madam President, I doubt it. I think people see this for exactly what it is, and that is raw partisanship. I think the more that they see these things -- and that is one of the reasons that I rejoiced that greater attention is paid to what we are doing here, because of C-SPAN -- the more people see these debates, the more they get it straight, the more they understand the fundamental difference between the two parties.

Now our colleague may very well prevail on this bill. We may pass a law forcing voter registration to occur in the Welfare office. We do not force it to occur in revenue offices and there will be some advantage that comes from that on a partisan basis.

But to the extent that we debate these issues, to the extent that we awaken the American people, when the sleeping giant that does the work in this country awakens and realizes what this debate and what so many of these other debates are about, when the American public is filled with rage about the outrageous actions that are undertaken in this great and sacred temple to American democracy, then they will speak and they will speak with a very clear voice.

I yield the floor.

Mr. NICKLES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I wish to congratulate and compliment my colleague from Texas, Senator Gramm, and also my friend and colleague from Kentucky, Senator McConnell, for their leadership and for their statements this morning.

[*S5686]

I hope the American people had a chance to listen and find out about this legislation, because I heard a lot of different statements made and I think it is important they look at the substance of why many of us, at least on this side of the aisle, are opposed to the motor-voter bill.

This Senator is adamantly opposed to this legislation because we are putting an unfunded mandate on the States. We had an amendment to correct that but, unfortunately, by a very partisan vote -- a very close vote -- we lost. So the net result is, we are going to be mandating to the States that they have to spend millions of dollars for voter registration, and in many cases they will not do a better job.

In my State of Oklahoma, Lance Ward, the secretary of the Oklahoma State Election Board says the costs will be \$1.2 million or \$1.3 million. I will ask to have a copy of his letter printed in the Record. He is opposed to the motor-voter bill.

I might mention that he is a Democrat. I might also mention that many throughout the country are very opposed to this and they happen to be Democrats, because they are opposed to unfunded State mandates, they are opposed to the Federal Government coming in and saying: "We are going to give you the benefit of our wisdom. We are going to tell you how to do it. We are going to tell you how to register voters."

Let me just read a portion of this.

Oklahoma's voter registration system is not broken; it works well. Oklahoma is third nationally in the percentage of voters registered and the cost to taxpayers is about \$120,000 annually. Major elements of the National Voter Registration Act will cost Oklahoma ten times that (amount and) will not increase registration, may reduce voter turnout, will force registration polls to close earlier, and will destroy Oklahoma's good registration system along with new and popular voting options that have potential to increase turnout.

In other words, it is the opinion of Lance Ward, secretary of the State Election Board, that this legislation is going to do more damage than good and it is going to cost about ten times as much money, which is kind of typical of a lot of Federal mandates today.

I would just say that many of us on the floor of the Senate tried to make sure that we did not pass an unfunded mandate, but, unfortunately, we were not successful.

Many States are doing an outstanding job in voter registration. As a matter of fact, I believe, following the 1992 cycle, 14 States had over 80 percent of their eligible voters registered.

We had an amendment on the floor of the Senate that would exempt those States that were doing an outstanding job. Some States have over 90 percent, including my State of Oklahoma. Why should we put this mandate on the States that are already doing a good job?

The motor-voter bill says: "We do not care how good a job you are doing, we do not care how economical you are going to do it, we are going to mandate registration procedures throughout the country."

I will read from page 5 of the committee report.

Voter registration agencies --

Keep in mind, States have the option to have registration set up anywhere they want under present law. We allow the States to have that discretion.

But this says, on page 5:

Each State shall designate as voter registration agencies --

(A) all offices in the State that provide public assistance.

Those are welfare agencies.

All offices in the State that provide State-funded programs primarily engaged in providing services to persons with disabilities. *** In addition to voter registration agencies designated under paragraph (2), each State shall designate other offices within the State as voter registration agencies.

The big point is that States shall designate as voter registration agencies all offices in the State that provide public assistance. It is optional to include government revenue offices.

So it is an option to include the tax offices, the revenue offices -- the taxpayers would frequent those offices -- but the bill mandates that they include welfare offices. I think that was designed for pure partisan political advantage.

Aside from this my primary objection is that we don't pay for it. We must stop coming up with unfunded State mandates.

My State happens to be going through some very difficult times financially right now. We are not able to meet all the demands that are now before our State. We have some serious budget shortfalls. Yet the Federal Government is going to come in and say we are going to mandate another \$1.2 million or \$1.3 million on the State of Oklahoma, even though we are already above 90 percent in voting age registration. That makes no sense whatsoever.

And it is not just Oklahoma.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Oklahoma State Election Board be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed on the Record, as follows:

Oklahoma State Election Board,
Oklahoma City, OK, January 27, 1993.

Hon. Don Nickles,
U.S. Senate, Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

Dear Senator Nickles: Once again, as my predecessor Lee Slater did before, I urge you to consider the effect the National Voter Registration Act will have on Oklahoma.

Oklahoma's voter registration system isn't broken: it works well. Oklahoma is third nationally in the percentage of voters registered and the cost to taxpayers is about \$120,000 annually. Major elements of the National Voter Registration Act will cost Oklahoma ten times that (see attached estimate), will not increase registration, may reduce voter turnout, will force registration rolls to close earlier, and will destroy Oklahoma's good registration system along with new and popular voting options that have potential to increase turnout.

In Oklahoma the National Voter Registration Act will be costly, unnecessary and counterproductive.

Attached is a sheet from the August 11, 1992, report from the Congressional Research Service Report for Congress which indicates that in the 1990 General Election Oklahoma ranked third nationally in registration of voting age population. Statistics are not yet available for 1992, but Oklahoma will continue to rank very high and, in spite of a 1993 purge to eliminate 350,000 or so persons who have not voted during the past eight years, Oklahoma's registration ranking will remain high in 1994.

Motor voter, mail and agency based registration will do away with Oklahoma's system of registrars who work almost everywhere and are paid when they seek out voters at retail and grocery stores.

Also in jeopardy is Oklahoma's new option for voting that permits anyone to vote by mail or in person before election day. Almost 100,000 people did that in November, three times the previous absentee record, and continued dramatic increases are expected unless there is unchecked abuse, which becomes far more possible with mail and similar registration schemes. The potential for fraud increases with each liberalization of registration or voting procedures. Oklahoma has kept a successful face-to-face registration system while opting to make voting easier and more convenient. If forced to abandon in-person registrars for impersonal and liberalized registration, the result likely will require a retreat from reforms that appear to increase voting.

Another negative effect of motor voter, mail and agency registration will be to increase the time when registration must be closed. Oklahoma now closes registration ten days before an election, among the shortest nationally. With the proposed systems, time must be added to permit forms to be transmitted to appropriate jurisdictions, checked and entered into registration records. When listed according to registration percentages it is impressive to note that states, such as Oklahoma, with short closed registration times rank high while states with the longer closed times generally rank low.

In Oklahoma voting, not registration, should be our focus. States should be judged based on meaningful performance. One organization promoting motor voter ranked Oklahoma as a "worst" registration state while extolling the virtues of their "best" list which includes Texas because their "best" states had liberal registration systems. For what it's worth, Oklahoma ranks 3rd in voter registration and Texas is 35th. Oklahoma ranks 25th in voter turnout and Texas is 43rd. In 1992, Oklahoma led the nation in turnout percentage increase, Texas was 43rd.

If voter registration must be reformed, let the reforms occur where there is some evidence change is needed. For Oklahoma, the National Voter Registration Act isn't the solution, it's a problem. It will not improve registration but will push Oklahoma backward in areas where you home state has been and is becoming a national leader.

I would be pleased to provide any information you request.

Sincerely,
Lance Ward,
Secretary, State Election Board.

OKLAHOMA VOTING/REGISTRATION HISTORY COMPARED TO NATIONAL AVERAGES

NOTE: This table is divided, and additional information on a particular entry may appear on more than one screen.

	Oklahoma VAP n1	Oklahoma registration
1962	1,478,000	1,160,515
1964	1,471,000	1,311,864
1966	1,489,000	1,185,225
1968	1,540,000	1,163,328
1970	1,605,000	1,201,666
1972	1,818,000	1,245,157
1974	1,896,000	1,341,209
1976	1,990,000	1,401,094
1978	2,081,000	1,366,019
1980	2,207,000	1,469,320
1982	2,371,000	1,613,827
1984	2,408,000	1,949,989
1986	2,405,000	2,018,401
1988	2,404,000	2,199,014
	Oklahoma registration percent of VAP	National average registration percent of VAP
1962	78.52	70.73
1964	89.18	74.79
1966	79.60	72.48
1968	75.54	73.28
1970	74.87	71.41
1972	68.49	73.60
1974	70.74	68.28
1976	70.41	70.63
1978	65.64	66.65
1980	66.58	70.32
1982	68.07	66.67
1984	80.98	72.84
1986	83.93	67.86
1988	91.47	70.50
	Oklahoma rank	Oklahoma turnout percent of VAP
1962	18	48.02

	Oklahoma VAP n1	Oklahoma registration
1964		
1966	10	63.39
1968	16	45.48
1970	23	61.24
1972	20	43.54
1974	34	56.65
1976	24	42.45
1978	32	54.89
1980	34	37.36
1982	35	52.09
1984	26	37.25
1986	15	52.15
1988	6	37.83
	3	48.71
	National average turnout percent of VAP	Oklahoma rank
1962		
1964	47.05	30
1966	61.92	31
1968	48.17	35
1970	60.84	30
1972	46.60	37
1974	55.21	30
1976	38.23	23
1978	53.55	29
1980	37.20	29
1982	52.56	31
1984	39.79	37
1986	53.11	32
1988	36.41	27
	50.15	33
	Oklahoma turnout percent of registration	National average turnout percent of registraton
1962		
1964	61.16	69.23
1966	71.08	83.45
1968	57.14	67.06
1970	81.07	82.46
1972	58.15	65.01
1974	82.71	74.49
1976	60.01	55.70
1978	77.96	75.37
1980	56.91	55.48
1982	78.25	74.26
1984	54.72	59.42
1986	64.39	72.58
1988	45.08	63.35
	53.25	72.47

n1 VAP -- Voting age population.

[*S5687]

Source: Prepared by staff of the Oklahoma State Election Board.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I also ask unanimous consent that a letter from the secretary of state of the State of New York, representing the National Association of Secretaries of State, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

State of New York,

Department of State,
Albany, NY, March 2, 1993.

Hon. Don Nickles,
U.S. Senate, Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

Dear Senator Nickles: As President of the National Association of Secretaries of State (NASS), I am writing to express our association's strong support for the concepts in H.R. 2, the National Voter Registration Act of 1993. In 1989, NASS went on record in support of the concept of Motor-Voter; a copy of that Resolution is attached for the record.

There is one caveat, however, in our support of H.R. 2. As an organization of state officials, we are understandably concerned about the fiscal impact of any unfunded federal mandate, no matter how laudable the intent. Therefore, as you will note in the Resolution, our support as an association for Motor-Voter is conditioned on the appropriation of funds to implement its requirements.

Therefore, I would like to express our Association's support of the amendment you plan to offer during Senate deliberation of the Motor-Voter bill which would condition implementation of the provisions of H.R. 2 on the provision of funds for states and localities to properly fulfill the requirements of the bill.

As an organization representing the chief election officials of forty-four states, NASS is in the forefront of attempts to ensure maximum voter participation. In the past we have undertaken studies and made recommendations aimed at identifying and eliminating structural barriers to registration and voting. Today, our work continues in many forms primary among them the work of the National Commission on the Renewal of American Democracy, also known as "Project Democracy."

The work of that Commission is showing clear proof that making it easier for citizens to register has a direct impact on electoral participation. Clearly "Motor-Voter" is one method that has been tried in several states with some noticeable results. To further substantiate the results of the efforts of some of the pioneering states which have already implemented a form of motor-voter, I would refer you to the testimony of several of my colleagues who testified before the Committee on House Administration's Subcommittee on Elections.

Motor-Voter and agency-based registration can have very positive impacts on participation in our democracy; providing funding will go a long way toward ensuring that they are properly effectuated. It will also initiate a new partnership approach between the federal government and the states in conducting our electoral process.

Sincerely,
Gail S. Shaffer.

Mr. NICKLES. The essence of this letter is: Please do not pass an unfunded mandate.

Madam President, I further ask unanimous consent that a letter from Bob Taft, secretary of state of Ohio, be printed in the record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Secretary of State,
Columbus, OH, March 3, 1993.

Hon. Don Nickles,
U.S. Senate, Hart Senate Building, Washington, DC.

Dear Senator Nickles: I am writing to endorse your amendment to H.R. 2, The National Voter Registration Act of 1993, which seeks to delay the bill's provisions from becoming effective until Congress authorizes and appropriates the funds to pay its costs to the States.

Ohio already has motor-voter and registration by mail. I have continuously sought to make voter registration more convenient and accessible for all Ohioans, and I support H.R. 2 because it will help us to accomplish that goal.

However, the federal motor-voter bill contains several mandates that are of great concern to me and the election officials throughout Ohio due to the costs associated with them.

In addition to the significant costs associated with the implementation of the motor-voter system described in H.R. 2, the purge procedure outlined in the bill are equally costly. Under H.R. 2, voters could not be removed from the voter rolls until after the second federal election following the mailing of a forwardable postcard. This will require Ohio to add two additional years to our purge cycles, causing boards of elections to bear the costs and the risks of inflated voter rolls during that period.

The use of the National Change of Address System is an option for certain counties. However, there is a substantial cost associated with that system which is likely to be prohibitive to a number of counties in Ohio whose budgets are under tremendous strain.

A delay in the effective date of this bill until Congress authorizes and appropriates the funds necessary to carry out this mandate clearly seems warranted given the already serious financial constraints other unfunded mandates have placed on State and local governments. I hope the Senate will adopt your amendment.

Thank you for your efforts on this measure.

Sincerely,
Bob Taft,
Secretary of State.

[*S568]

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that a table from the Committee for the Study of the American Electorate, showing total registration as a percentage of voting-age population 1980-92 be printed in the Record, as well.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TOTAL REGISTRATION AS A PERCENTAGE OF VAP 1992-1960

NOTE: This table is divided, and additional information on a particular entry may appear on more than one screen.

State	1992 VAP	1992 reg.
Alabama	3,056,000	2,367,972
Alaska	395,000	315,058
Arizona	2,749,000	1,963,492
Arkansas	1,768,000	1,317,944
California	22,668,000	15,101,473
Colorado	2,501,000	2,002,522
Connecticut	2,535,000	1,955,268
Delaware	525,000	339,968
District of Columbia	459,000	340,953
Florida	10,586,000	6,541,825
Georgia	4,950,000	3,177,061
Hawaii	889,000	464,495
Idaho	740,000	608,939
Illinois	8,568,000	6,600,358
Indiana	4,176,000	3,180,157
Iowa	2,075,000	1,703,576
Kansas	1,836,000	1,365,849
Kentucky	2,779,000	2,076,263
Louisiana	2,992,000	2,289,855
Maine	944,000	876,986
Maryland	3,719,000	2,463,010
Massachusetts	4,607,000	3,346,111
Michigan	6,923,000	6,157,675
Minnesota	3,278,000	3,138,901
Mississippi	1,861,000	1,640,150
Missouri	3,858,000	3,057,413
Montana	586,000	529,882
Nebraska	1,167,000	951,395
Nevada	1,013,000	649,865
New Hampshire	852,000	660,895
New Jersey	5,943,000	4,060,337
New Mexico	1,104,000	707,642
New York	13,609,000	9,193,391
North Carolina	5,217,000	3,817,380
Ohio	8,146,000	6,542,931
Oklahoma	2,328,000	2,302,279
Oregon	2,226,000	1,774,449
Pennsylvania	9,129,000	5,992,696
Rhode Island	776,000	554,081
South Carolina	2,672,000	1,537,140
South Dakota	502,000	448,292
Tennessee	3,783,000	2,726,449
Texas	12,524,000	8,422,127
Utah	1,142,000	965,211

State	1992 VAP	1992 reg.
Vermont	429,000	282,371
Virginia	4,842,000	3,054,489
Washington	3,818,000	2,814,680
West Virginia	1,350,000	956,172
Wyoming	322,000	235,116
Overall	184,917,000	133,673,544
State	1992 percent VAP reg'd	
Alabama	77.49	
Alaska	79.76	
Arizona	71.43	
Arkansas	74.54	
California	66.62	
Colorado	80.07	
Connecticut	77.13	
Delaware	64.76	
District of Columbia	74.28	
Florida	61.80	
Georgia	64.18	
Hawaii	52.25	
Idaho	82.29	
Illinois	77.03	
Indiana	76.15	
Iowa	82.10	
Kansas	74.39	
Kentucky	74.71	
Louisiana	76.53	
Maine	92.90	
Maryland	66.23	
Massachusetts	72.63	
Michigan	88.95	
Minnesota	95.76	
Mississippi	88.13	
Missouri	79.25	
Montana	90.42	
Nebraska	81.52	
Nevada	64.15	
New Hampshire	77.57	
New Jersey	68.32	
New Mexico	64.10	
New York	67.55	
North Carolina	73.17	
Ohio	80.32	
Oklahoma	98.90	
Oregon	79.71	
Pennsylvania	65.64	
Rhode Island	71.40	
South Carolina	57.53	
South Dakota	89.30	
Tennessee	72.07	
Texas	67.25	
Utah	84.52	
Vermont	89.36	

State	1992 VAP	1992 reg.	
Virginia	63.08		
Washington	73.72		
West Virginia	70.83		
Wyoming	73.02		
Overall	72.29		
State	Percent VAP reg'd	1988	+/- 92-88
Alabama	79.43		-1.94
Alaska	81.86		-2.10
Arizona	70.69		0.74
Arkansas	68.74		5.80
California	66.67		-0.05
Colorado	83.18		-3.11
Connecticut	72.07		5.06
Delaware	63.93		0.83
District of Columbia	63.51		10.77
Florida	62.78		-0.98
Georgia	64.04		0.14
Hawaii	54.45		-2.20
Idaho	81.43		0.86
Illinois	73.61		3.42
Indiana	69.71		6.44
Iowa	79.53		2.57
Kansas	68.50		5.89
Kentucky	73.63		1.08
Louisiana	71.60		4.93
Maine	94.14		-1.24
Maryland	66.04		0.19
Massachusetts	71.74		0.89
Michigan	87.47		1.48
Minnesota	91.13		4.63
Mississippi	86.49		1.64
Missouri	76.63		2.62
Montana	86.27		4.15
Nebraska	75.99		5.53
Nevada	55.34		8.81
New Hampshire	79.53		-1.96
New Jersey	68.05		0.27
New Mexico	63.36		0.74
New York	63.44		4.11
North Carolina	70.33		2.84
Ohio	78.46		1.86
Oklahoma	92.94		5.96
Oregon	72.73		6.98
Pennsylvania	64.07		1.57
Rhode Island	71.73		-0.33
South Carolina	56.80		0.73
South Dakota	85.00		4.30
Tennessee	66.04		6.03
Texas	68.81		-1.56
Utah	75.63		8.89
Vermont	82.93		6.43
Virginia	62.98		0.10

State	1992 VAP	1992 reg.
Washington	71.59	2.13
West Virginia	69.29	1.54
Wyoming	66.72	6.30
Overall	70.69	1.60
State	1984	+/- 92-84
	Percent VAP reg'd	
Alabama	81.03	-3.54
Alaska	87.22	-7.46
Arizona	65.64	5.79
Arkansas	67.93	6.61
California	68.26	-1.64
Colorado	68.99	11.08
Connecticut	75.09	2.04
Delaware	68.42	-3.66
District of Columbia	56.08	18.20
Florida	64.44	-2.64
Georgia	64.73	-0.55
Hawaii	55.34	-3.09
Idaho	84.74	-2.45
Illinois	76.59	0.44
Indiana	76.34	-0.19
Iowa	81.36	0.74
Kansas	71.75	2.64
Kentucky	75.06	-0.35
Louisiana	72.25	4.28
Maine	94.81	-1.91
Maryland	69.14	-2.91
Massachusetts	73.17	-0.54
Michigan	89.66	-0.71
Minnesota	94.64	1.12
Mississippi	92.60	-4.47
Missouri	80.07	-0.82
Montana	89.14	1.28
Nebraska	76.88	4.64
Nevada	51.80	12.35
New Hampshire	74.29	3.28
New Jersey	71.51	-3.19
New Mexico	65.03	-0.93
New York	67.84	-0.29
North Carolina	71.32	1.85
Ohio	80.74	-0.42
Oklahoma	80.91	17.99
Oregon	81.08	-1.37
Pennsylvania	68.90	-3.26
Rhode Island	73.77	-2.37
South Carolina	58.59	-1.06
South Dakota	86.99	2.31
Tennessee	73.93	-1.86
Texas	69.18	-1.93
Utah	82.31	2.21
Vermont	85.15	4.21
Virginia	63.19	-0.11
Washington	76.18	-2.46

State	1992 VAP	1992 reg.
West Virginia	72.00	-1.17
Wyoming	67.60	5.42
Overall	72.82	-0.53
State	1980	+/- 92-80
	Percent VAP reg'd	
Alabama	77.70	-0.21
Alaska	93.65	-13.89
Arizona	56.89	14.54
Arkansas	73.03	1.51
California	64.74	1.88
Colorado	67.56	12.51
Connecticut	74.06	3.07
Delaware	69.58	-4.82
District of Columbia	58.35	15.93
Florida	63.47	-1.67
Georgia	63.74	0.44
Hawaii	57.79	-5.54
Idaho	89.94	-7.65
Illinois	75.66	1.37
Indiana	75.65	0.50
Iowa	81.81	0.29
Kansas	74.60	-0.21
Kentucky	67.78	6.93
Louisiana	69.04	7.42
Maine	93.71	-0.81
Maryland	69.04	-0.81
Massachusetts	73.79	-1.16
Michigan	87.82	1.13
Minnesota	95.04	0.72
Mississippi	86.22	1.91
Missouri	79.51	-0.26
Montana	88.64	1.78
Nebraska	75.57	5.95
Nevada	49.39	14.76
New Hampshire	82.06	-4.49
New Jersey	69.37	-1.05
New Mexico	72.52	-8.42
New York	61.07	6.48
North Carolina	64.92	8.25
Ohio	76.03	4.29
Oklahoma	66.05	32.85
Oregon	81.35	-1.64
Pennsylvania	65.49	0.15
Rhode Island	77.11	-5.71
South Carolina	55.78	1.75
South Dakota	91.70	-2.40
Tennessee	70.98	1.09
Texas	65.54	1.71
Utah	83.61	0.91
Vermont	84.30	5.06
Virginia	58.59	4.49
Washington	73.57	0.15
West Virginia	73.90	-3.07

State	1992 VAP	1992 reg.
Wyoming	66.09	6.93
Overall	70.24	2.05

Source: Committee for the Study of the American Electorate.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, this table will show that many States are doing an outstanding job, and yet we are still going to mandate to those States that they have to provide voter registration at welfare agencies, et cetera, without paying for it. Sorry States, or sorry counties, we don't care how much it costs. This is big Government telling you how to operate your registration business.

Madam President, I see this as just part of a cycle of several things that are going on.

The Senator from Kentucky said earlier, "Well, many Republicans defeated the so-called jobs bill."

Well, if he wants to debate that issue again, I will be happy to debate it. It was not a jobs bill. It was a bill that was going to add \$19.5 billion to the deficit. It was a politicians' pork barrel bill. Proponents of it were just going to go out and spend \$19.5 billion and then have the nerve or the audacity to call it an emergency so it would not be counted as part of the budget. They wanted \$19.5 billion to be added to the national debt.

Many of us were very opposed to that. We spoke out loudly. We had several amendments to reduce that amount.

The Senator from Kentucky mentioned that \$4 billion of that went through. He said no one voted in opposition, because it passed by voice vote by unanimous consent.

I will tell my friend from Kentucky that this is one Senator who voted against the authorization bill providing \$4 billion of unemployment compensation that was not paid for. As a matter of fact, many of our colleagues voted against it because we did not want to add to the national debt. We already had a vote on the record that says that we do not think this is right.

Many of us said, when the unemployment compensation authorization bill came up, that we should not pass it unless we pay for it. When we had unemployment compensation extensions in the past -- and we have had three in the last few years -- we paid for it.

You might remember, that President Bush insisted on, and actually used his veto to enforce, that if Congress was going to pass an unemployment extension that we would pay for it.

Most of us were willing to make the cuts necessary. We offered amendments to pay for the extension. We said let us have cuts in other areas. The ones that passed, if I remember, in 1990 and 1991 -- maybe it is 1992 -- paid for it by tax increases. I did not particularly like that, but at least we paid for them.

So I want the record to be very clear many of us have been very consistent. We do not want to add to the national debt. We do not want to break the budget rules. And, frankly, the so-called stimulus plan broke the budget rules because proponents claimed it was an emergency situation. Well, most know that emergencies are earthquakes or natural disasters, significant events we feel we need to move on immediately. The so-called stimulus package funded 40 different programs, programs that were already in existence and certainly was not an emergency. It added more money to spend and added all of it, 100 percent of it, to the national debt. So we opposed the pork-barrel package.

Many of us on this side of the aisle have been consistent in opposing unfunded Government mandates. That is exactly why most of us are opposing the so-called motor-voter. We do not want unfunded mandates.

When the bill passed the Senate, we gave the States the option to have it at welfare offices or other offices, including tax collection agencies. Lo and behold, it comes back from conference and it is a mandate to offer registration at welfare offices, and an option to do it at revenue offices.

Again, many of us have consistently tried to say we do not want to pass unfunded mandates on States and cities and counties. We do not want to pass mandates on the private sector that are going to cost jobs. This is the reason why this Senator tried to pass an amendment calling for an economic and employment impact statement of new laws and new regulations proposed by Congress and Government agencies. Congress should know how much it is going to cost. We at least ought to have that information. If you are talking about costing over 10,000 jobs, we should know it. Or if the

law or regulation is going to cost the economy over \$100 million, we should know it. This amendment came within one vote of passing on the bill to elevate EPA to Cabinet level status.

I might mention we had a few Democrats who voted with me. I thank them

[*S5689] for that. The amendment lost by one vote. I assure my colleagues that I am going to try again because that is a fundamental issue that is most important, and it is very much in sync with what we have here. We do not want unfunded mandates, and we also think we should know what the cost of legislation is. If it is going to put people out of work, we should know it before we pass it.

I will just give a couple of examples. Congress is going to be considering, right now, a proposal by President Clinton to increase Btu taxes. The Btu tax is an energy tax. It is a gasoline tax. It is going to cost everybody in America 8 to 10 cents a gallon more for gasoline. That is in spite of the fact that when President Clinton was a candidate he said he was opposed to a gasoline tax increase. Now as President he is in favor of it. An energy tax is going to cost jobs. It is going to increase diesel costs probably 8 to 10 cents a gallon; everybody's home heating oil about 8 to 10 cents a gallon -- in the original proposal it probably would have been more -- everybody's utility bills, residential customers, will see a 4- to 4.5-percent increase; utility bills for industrial customers in my State, 7.9 percent, and in most States probably a comparable amount. It is a tax that is twice as high on oil as it is on coal. I thought one of the reasons he wanted to pass it was for environmental purposes. That does not seem to make sense.

The real impact is it is going to put a lot of people out of work. I think we should know that. The biggest private employer in the State of Oklahoma is American Airlines, and they lost \$985 million last year. This tax is going to cost them \$200 to \$300 million a year. They cannot pass this charge on. They are already losing money. They are hemorrhaging money. Yet I would like to know how much that is going to cost. They are laying people off today. How many more people will lose their jobs as a result of President Clinton's gasoline tax increase and aviation fuel tax-increase bill? I want to know. I want to know before we vote.

Again, many of us on this side of the aisle have been very consistent. No, we do not want to add more money to the debt. We do not want to just spend money we do not have. We do not want to pass unfunded mandates on States and on cities and on counties and on employers. Yet we see a lot of proposals coming down the pike. This administration is wound up. They are geared up. They are ready to go. They want to have a domestic agenda, and their domestic agenda is going to mandate that health insurance be provided by every employer large and small. This mandate will cost hundreds of thousands of jobs, and we need to know how many before we pass it.

I happen to be one of the few people in the Senate that came from the private sector. I had a small business. I had a small business that did not provide health insurance for our employees. It was a little janitorial service. If you pass that mandate, what you are going to do is you are going to kill a lot of those little businesses that are trying to grow, trying to get started. They just will not happen.

So we need to know what the impact of legislation is before we pass it, whether it is a Federal mandate on States and counties or a Federal mandate on businesses. We need to know before we do something foolish, before we do something that is going to cost jobs, before we do something that will suffocate an economy that is already not as good as we would like for it to be, not as good as it should be, not as good as it could be. So it is awfully important we be careful that we not just add to the debt.

You talk about adding to the debt and then raising taxes. Congress is now in the process of considering the largest tax increase in history. The Finance Committee and the Ways and Means Committee are now meeting to consider ways to raise \$273 billion to take out of the private sector with the thought we are going to take this money from the private sector because we can spend it better. This is a massive tax increase. I will tell this Chamber, it is going to cost a lot of jobs. We need to know how many jobs it is going to cost.

At the same time, we have the President's health care task force headed by Mrs. Clinton that is talking about a new payroll tax that will cost jobs. They are going to sock it to employers. They are going to sock it to the people who are trying to provide jobs. The administration is talking about a value added tax, which is just a hidden inflationary tax that is going to hit every American. They are talking about mandating health insurance on all employers. That is going to cost hundreds of thousands of jobs and cripple a lot of small businesses. And now we are looking at a new program. There is no limit to the new programs.

I was in a Subcommittee on Appropriations yesterday where there is a lot of discussion about a national service program. Everyone is so excited about this new program. There will be a new Federal corporation for national service. I think it is going to be a new boondoggle. I think it is a program that has enormous potential to explode in cost. As a matter of fact, even under the administration's own figures it explodes in costs. It starts out this year at a cost of \$394 million. The President's budget requests \$394 million for fiscal year 1994.

In 1995 they are requesting \$1.25 billion. That almost doubles again in 1996 at \$2.4 billion. And by 1998 it increases to \$3.4 billion. This new Federal program starts at a little less than \$400 million in 1994 and in a period of just 4 years we are up to \$3.4 billion.

What are we going to get for that \$3.4 billion? I have heard some grandiose statements. We are going to make college available for everyone, and if they work for a couple of years, we are going to give them a couple of years of Federal aid.

Wait a minute, let us look at how much this is going to cost.

The President's program initially talked about \$6,500 of educational assistance per year for each participant. The administration scaled it back to \$5,000? This was done because the program would have been much more beneficial than the GI bill, so they scaled it back to \$5,000 per year.

So, if a person works 1 year they are going to get a \$5,000 educational benefit. At first, one might think national service is a worthwhile program, but at what cost to the taxpayer. The administration stated in the budget that the program would benefit 25,000 people in 1994 and 150,000 people by 1998. The cost per participant in 1998, if you divide the \$3.4 billion by 150,000 recipients, totals \$22,667 per participant for 1 year of service. If they work 2 years, they get twice that amount. So, you are talking about \$45,000 per participant for 2 years of service. And we are going to benefit 150,000 people.

My land, I hate to tell the administration this, but presently the Federal Government is benefiting, in 1990 3.2 million people with the Pell Grant Program.

There are 3.9 million people in the Guaranteed Student Loan Program. We help the guaranteed student loan participant at a cost of \$2,700 per person and the Pell grants, \$1,400 per person. Although I realize both these programs have their problems and need reform, they are still a lot more economical than \$45,000 per participant per year that we are looking at in 1998 that is only going to help 150,000 people under the National Service Program proposed by the President. We are talking about helping 150,000 versus 8 million.

I will tell you, that this National Service Program will cost more than the President has estimated. I asked Peter Edelman, the President's senior adviser to the White House Office of National Service, how much this program was going to cost. He stated that the new program's cost will follow the VISTA Program. According to the 1993 annual report of the Commission on National and Community Service, the VISTA Program right now costs about \$16,000 per participant per year. Mr. Edelman gave estimates of \$8,500 per year for the stipend to be paid to each participant this figure contradicts what the Commission says in their report.

It is also assuming almost zero for administration expenses. That is not the case. It will not be the case. This national service is really going to turn into national servitude.

Then I have a problem because I am trying to figure out who is going to decide who does what. Mr. Edelman said it is going to be national service but it is not going to displace anybody's job. We are going to make sure it does not

[*S5690] take union workers' jobs; we are going to make sure nobody in the private sector loses their job because of this program. Therefore, politicians or bureaucrats are going to decide what worthwhile jobs are going to be done. Although there are projects that are worthwhile, I fear the majority of the jobs will be Government "make-work" jobs. They will be jobs where they are learning no real skills.

We have millions of volunteers in this country who are working at almost no expense helping to provide valuable services to society. Why does the Federal Government need to try to compete with them? Why would we try to duplicate their services? Why would we have the idea the Federal Government could come in and do a better job than volunteers? I do not know.

What kind of a training is it for a person to go out and work for the Government for 2 years in exchange for \$10,000? What are they learning? I am afraid they might learn some work habits that are not very good. Many people have heard the saying, "Well, that is good enough for Government work." I do not know that is the kind of work ethic or training we will be giving our young people.

I do not know that I want politicians and bureaucrats deciding what kind of social services should be provided that are not being provided today by volunteers. I will concede that there would be some good programs that would help some people. I am not saying there could not be some successes somewhere, but I am concerned we are talking about a national program that would cost the U.S. taxpayer billions of dollars. In Mr. Edelman's statement, he talks about hundreds of thousands of beneficiaries. Wow, this thing is going to cost a lot. This is a program which will only benefit 150,000 people at a cost by 1998 of \$3.4 billion. This program is new spending. That is all money that is just going on to added Federal debt. Money that will come from the U.S. taxpayer.

I just have serious reservations about it. I heard a couple of my colleagues say, when it was introduced yesterday -- and they are very excited about it; they are excited about this new Federal Corporation for National Service. I am not sure it should not be called new "Federal Corporation for National Servitude," where politicians get to decide what individuals will do in exchange for a year: "Yes, you give me a year of your service, young person, middle age person, senior citizen, and we will give you a \$5,000 educational benefit."

I am stating today for the record the cost of this program will explode. If it is an attractive program, the demand will increase. In 1990, there were 14 million students enrolled in college. This program has the potential to expand to monumental proportion.

My guess is you will have a lot of programs that would be worthless and a lot of programs that would have some merit. My point is we are going to be creating a new Federal program that will explode in cost. If it costs \$3.4 billion for 150,000 students, and you have a total population of 14 million, you can see the demand can greatly exceed our wherewithal, our capability of paying for it. If we are going to start the program in 1994 at \$400 million and just four years later we are spending \$3.4 billion and you are not servicing or helping but a very small fraction of a percent of available participants, you can see this program can only explode, can only go very high, not to mention the fact of the national servitude.

So the cost per job, the cost per participant, \$5,000 for 1 year service, another \$5,000 for 2 years of service, that is \$10,000. We probably would be much better off to give the participant the \$5,000 or \$10,000 than to say, "Now we want you to work for Uncle Sam," or "We want you to commit to 2 years of public service and we are going to pay you a stipend based on minimum wage."

I asked Mr. Edelman yesterday if he knew what minimum wage was. He said, "Yes, \$4.25." I asked: "Do you know that the administration is talking about increasing it?" He said no. The administration is going to index the minimum wage for inflation. This means the cost of this program is going to explode.

The President has also said the beneficiaries under the program are going to receive medical care. That may cost a couple thousand dollars per year. And we are going to provide day care services.

So you start adding up the costs. If a person is drawing minimum wage, if they work 2,080 hours a year, you are already looking at about \$8,800 per year. If they receive health benefits, that could be \$2,000, \$3,000 a year, assuming it is an individual. If it is a family, you may be talking about \$4,000 or \$5,000 a year. So now you are up to \$10,000. Day care services, let us throw in another \$1,000 or \$2,000. And you are up to \$12,000 before the educational benefit of \$5,000 or administrative costs.

I am saying this program will explode. The program we are going to emulate, VISTA, costs \$16,000 per year. So the beginning of this program is not going to cost the \$8,500 the administration is talking about, it is going to be at least, I am going to say, \$12,000 or \$13,000 per year of community service excluding the educational benefit.

My guess is by 1998, it will exceed the \$22,000 projected by the administration. It will exceed the \$22,000. I want that in the Record. I may well be here in 1998, and I want to refer to the Record and find out how much it is costing. Maybe my friend and colleague from Kentucky will be here and we can look back and see this program and see how much it costs per participant.

If they serve in the program for 2 years, if it is \$13,000 a year now -- I think it is going to be over \$22,000 a year by 1998 -- if they serve in it for 2 years, that is \$22,000 in 1994, it will be a little more in 1998. This program compared to the Pell grants or the Guaranteed Student Loan Program is not economical.

I think the administration is getting ready to start a program that will grow astronomically. It will exceed any inflation rate that anyone could even fathom today.

I think we have to be very careful. Some of us serve on the Appropriations Committee; some of us serve on the Budget Committee; and some of us are dedicated to the proposition that we should be cutting the deficit and that we should not be opening and creating new programs that will only explode in cost.

Madam President, I am truly concerned about a trend I see in this Congress. There is a pattern of new spending, increasing the deficit, increasing taxes, and a propensity to place unfunded mandates on States, local governments, and employers. I have consistently opposed all of these things and that is why I am before you today opposing the motor-voter bill.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that two articles, one, the "National Service Boondoggle" that was in the Wall Street Journal on March 2 of this year, and also "National Service and Fidel's Sugar Cane," which was in the Wall Street Journal on March 25, be printed in the Record, as well as a chart showing the cost per participant which we have calculated.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 2, 1993]

THE "NATIONAL SERVICE" BOONDOGGLE

(By Doug Bandow)

Pacifist William James hated war but liked its fruit. In 1919, he penned words that have become well-nigh immortal, calling for a "moral equivalent of war" in which "the martial virtues" would be inculcated in young men in peacetime. "Our gilded youths would be drafted off," he wrote, "to get the childishness knocked out of them, and to come back into society with healthier sympathies and soberer ideas."

James's vision became the fount of a host of contradictory proposals involving military conscription, universal civilian service and voluntary programs. The latest is President Clinton's plan, unveiled at Rutgers yesterday, to provide as many as 150,000 students with two years of college tuition for every year of service in a government-approved job.

Mr. Clinton's program is nothing new. In 1988, the Democratic Leadership Council, to which he belonged, proposed a massive "Citizens Corps" of young people. The program was premised on alleged American decadence, self-absorption and selfishness, inflamed during the "decade of greed," as the 1980s were dubbed.

Candidate Clinton was too interested in being elected president to criticize potential voters in these terms, however. He used more positive rhetoric to propose allowing 250,000 or more people to work off their student loans through government service. Deficit concerns have caused the administration to propose starting with a pilot program, to expand over time. Still, Mr. Clinton said in

[*S5691] his radio address last Saturday that he ultimately wants to reach "hundreds of thousands of students."

Service seems so obviously a good thing that many people automatically embrace politicians who use the phrase "national service." The basic question, however, is service to whom? Proposals for national service assume that citizens are responsible not to each other but to the state. Even voluntary programs like Mr. Clinton's imply a unity of society and state, with work for the latter equated to service to the former.

Opportunities for genuine service abound. Roughly 80 million people now participate in some volunteer activities. Much more could be done, of course. But the remedy is not yet another federal program.

Another bias held by national-service advocates is that "public" service is inherently better than private service. What makes shelving books in a library more laudable or valuable than stocking shelves in a bookstore? Private-sector workers -- health-care professionals, medical and scientific researchers, business entrepreneurs and inventors, artists -- provide enormous public benefits.

Moreover, the implementation problems are dizzying. Mr. Clinton said that he would not allow any job displacement, which would prevent participants from performing the most valuable work. Any job that could possibly be handled by a union member would have to be excluded to avoid unremitting labor opposition.

More important, what work would participants do? Today the Peace Corps and Vista, along with the more than 60 state and local programs, involve only some 18,000 people. How would we employ 150,000, 250,000, 500,000 or more people?

They would meet "unmet social needs," national-service advocates respond. But as long as human wants are unlimited, the real number of "unmet" social (as well as business) "needs" is infinite. It is meaningless to talk about millions of "unmet" needs; and since labor is not a free resource, it would be even more foolish to try to satisfy all of them.

The key to the national service debate is opportunity costs. Paying young people to shelve library books requires forgoing both whatever else could be done with the money they are paid and whatever else the participants would do. Indeed, the Clinton program would delay the entry of hundreds of thousands of people into higher educational studies and the work force. There is no reason to assume that a dollar going to national service will yield more benefits than an additional dollar spent on medical research, technological innovation or any number of other purposes, private and public.

Another problem involves the military. The end of the Cold War has slowed recruiting. Providing educational benefits, long an important military vehicle for attracting college-capable youth, for civilian work may hinder recruiting for what remains the most fundamental form of national service -- defending the country.

Still, what of the serious problems confronting us? In many instances the government bars effective private responses. Minimum wage laws forbid the hiring of dedicated but unskilled people and inhibit rehabilitation programs, like that run by the Salvation Army; restrictions on paratransit operations limit private transportation for the disabled.

In any case, only narrowly targeted responses -- attracting a few thousand extra caregivers for the terminally ill, for instance -- are likely to work. The pervasive fraud and waste endemic to "public service" programs like CETA hardly augur well for yet another large-scale federal effort at social engineering.

Further imagine the bureaucracy necessary to decide what jobs constitute "service." Who would sort through union objections to "unfair competition," match hundreds of thousands of participants to individual posts and monitor the quality of people's work? Consider the disastrous mess made of the student loan program by the Education Department; not surprisingly, the Congressional Research Service has warned that the government cannot administer the program as efficiently as the private sector. An unwieldy bureaucracy enforcing the controls that inevitably follow federal money is not likely to promote inexpensive and innovative solutions to human needs.

Even worse, federal involvement is likely to politicize private humanitarian activities. Congressmen oppose efforts to close local government offices; interest groups twist social programs to their benefit; labor unions block proposals to contract out work. Imagine the likely infighting over a program involving the services of hundreds of thousands of young people. What, for instance, will Mr. Clinton say when the Democratic Party's favorite political, sexual and social lobbies, like Act Up and Planned Parenthood, come calling to demand "their" quotas of service workers?

Finally, money has to be an issue when the president is calling for massive tax hikes. The administration is initially proposing to spend \$9.5 billion over five years, but the costs could escalate quickly. Providing participants with two

years of school for every year of work means that they will earn more than \$60,000 -- say, \$40,000 in tuition breaks and \$20,000-plus in salary and health benefits -- for "serving" two years. That's over \$9 billion for 150,000 participants, not counting the costs of the federal bureaucracy necessary to manage the program.

Alas, Mr. Clinton's scheme would likely end up no bargain. It would expand federal power, politicize the independent sector, increase an already nightmarish deficit and siphon tens of thousands of young people out of productive private labor and into make-work projects.

What we need instead is a renewed commitment to individual service -- some part-time, some full-time; some through the family, some through churches and some through civic groups. America's strength is its combination of humanitarian impulses, private association and diversity. Which is why we should be weep the "national" out of service.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 25, 1993]

NATIONAL SERVICE AND FIDEL'S SUGAR CANE

(By Joshua Gilder)

Among the most celebrated items in President Clinton's economic package, headed for a Senate vote soon, is his program for national service, a plan he also has called a new "domestic Peace Corps," whereby students would be able to pay off college loans with community service. For those who like the idea, I offer as a cautionary tale the account of my own experience as a beneficiary of the first "Domestic Peace Corps" 25 years ago.

That program, started by Lyndon Johnson in 1964, was officially dubbed Vista, for Volunteers in Service to America. Although it didn't have the college loan component of the Clinton plan, it was remarkably similar in the way it was sold to the American people as a way of tapping the "energy" and "idealism" of our nation's youth and directing it toward the poor, especially in the ghettos. As a sophomore at the public high school in Scarsdale, a well-to-do suburb just outside New York City, I didn't exactly fit the profile of your typical ghetto resident, but to Ben and Jerry that was the point.

Ben and Jerry (not of ice-cream fame) were two Vista volunteers who had come to Scarsdale to organize a local chapter of the SDS. This was before the SDS, or Students for a Democratic Society, had turned violent. It was still just a "student organization," albeit a strongly leftist one, and I, going through my 1960s-style adolescent rebellion, accompanied my friends to a meeting.

Ben and Jerry were older, college graduates I believe, bearded and affable. I remember we sat around in awe as they talked to us about the SDS and the U.S. "war on the people of Vietnam." Their mission in Scarsdale, they said, was to "radicalize the sons and daughters of the middle class and so bring on The Revolution." Ben and Jerry clearly enjoyed the irony of getting the middle class to pay, through the Vista program, for its own subversion.

At first our meetings entailed complaining about the fascistic Scarsdale High School administration, but along around the third meeting Ben and Jerry got more serious. They told us about the trouble Comrade Fidel was having with his sugar harvest. All progressive peoples were expressing "their solidarity with our brothers in Cuba" by joining the Venceremos Brigade and flying down to Cuba to cut sugar cane.

For a 15-year-old who was at that time saving his allowance to buy the latest Jefferson Airplane album, traveling to Cuba was prohibitively expensive. Ben and Jerry helpfully explained, however, that if we didn't have the money ourselves and if our parents wouldn't pay for it, then "money could be found."

My mind ground its gears trying to shift up into that concept. Somebody was going to pay my way to Cuba to cut sugar cane? Who were these generous people? I asked. Ben and Jerry said they would rather not say, but there were people with money who believed in the cause. Really? I tried to calculate how much sugar cane I would have to cut to even pay back the cost of the plane ticket.

I'd like to say I had a sudden revelation of what was wrong, but that didn't come until many years afterward, when I saw a documentary with interviews of several students who went down on the Venceremos Brigades. They described very little cane harvesting, but a lot of communist indoctrination. Volunteers who showed promise were persuaded to go for further "study" in the Soviet Union, where they were recruited by the KGB.

At the time, I was mostly concerned about my coming midterms, but I suppose my commitment to The Revolution wasn't really that strong either. In the end, no one in our group signed up. Ben and Jerry stopped coming around and the Scarsdale Chapter of the SDS disbanded.

Whether Ben and Jerry's superiors in Vista knew what they were up to, I have no idea, but the record suggests my experience wasn't unique. The radicalization of Vista became endemic in the '70s and, like the Legal Services Corp., its "volunteers" became notorious for confrontational tactics -- organizing tenant strikes and such. This continued until the '80s, when the Reagan administration, in yet another example of its "callous indifference to the poor," cut Vista's budget severely.

The most interesting thing about the episode, however, is the response I get from liberals when I mention my experience with Ben and Jerry. They are shocked. Shocked! But not that the U.S. government was funding Soviet recruitment. They are shocked at my "Mc-Carthyite tactics." If what I say is

[*S5692] true, I'm told, it illustrates nothing more than that some "idealistic young people" got carried away in the '60s.

The fact is that the unseemly side of the radical left exists quite comfortably under the institutional umbrella of liberal activist groups -- yes, even today. When it became apparent that President-elect Clinton's "cluster coordinator" for education, labor and the humanities, Johnnetta Cole, was a member of the national committee of the Venceremos Brigade in the 1970s -- and is still an ardent supporter of Castro -- the response of the Clinton transition team was a peevish, So What?

Ms. Cole didn't get the top job she was expecting. But Donna Shalala, the new head of the Department of Health and Human Services, who had recommended Ms. Cole for her present job as president of Spelman College in Atlanta, obviously suffered no embarrassment.

Now that support for Cuba appears more and more like a futile exercise in left-wing nostalgia, the activist agenda is focusing on domestic policy, specifically toward children. We see the cutting edge in the New York City school system, where the recent push has been for "diversity," including lessons in the gay and lesbian "lifestyle."

As in the past, the left wants the government to bankroll its agenda, and a domestic Peace Corps is the perfect vehicle. Who is going to employ all these activist wannabes? Can we doubt that it is the Johnnetta Cole and Donna Shalala types who will end up running the new domestic Peace Corps? Is it hard to imagine what kind of lesson they will be teaching all those "idealistic young people" who sign up for "national service?"

Mr. Clinton is clearly underestimating his budget for the program. Independent analysts say it could cost as much as \$12 billion. That could cut a lot of cane.

NATIONAL SERVICE

NOTE: This table is divided, and additional information on a particular entry may appear on more than one screen.

	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998
Budget authority (billions)	(n1)					\$0.394
Outlays (billions)	(n1)					0.103
Number of participants	(n1)					25,000
Cost per participants	(n1)					\$4,120
Budget authority (billions)			\$1.250			\$2.400
Outlays (billions)			\$1.042			\$1.890
Number of participants			(?)			(?)
Cost per participants			(?)			(?)
Budget authority (billions)					\$3.400	\$3.400
Outlays (billions)					\$3.000	\$3.400
Number of participants					(?)	150,000
Cost per participants					(?)	\$22,667
			Total			
Budget authority (billions)			\$10.844			
Outlays (billions)			\$9.435			
Number of participants			(?)			
Cost per participants			(?)			

n1 President Clinton's stimulus package contained \$15,000,000 in budget authority and \$12,000,000 in outlays for the Commission on National and Community Service to initiate a National Service pilot program.

Note: The pilot program would have benefited 1,000 participants at a cost per participant of \$12,000.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. FORD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. FORD. I will not be very long. I just want to make a point, I say to my good friend from Missouri.

Madam President, listening to the Senator from Oklahoma, you would think we were on the national service legislation. We have a timeframe here in order to discuss the 1993 Voter Registration Act.

Now we are back at the same old game of fear. We throw \$2,000 in here; we throw \$4,000 there; we throw \$5,000 here, and it just explodes. Well, everybody can guess like everybody else, but nobody here has a crystal ball and we are supposed to be talking about registering to vote. So we get to fear gain, and so we talk about loss of jobs.

We throw out the value-added tax; we throw out the payroll tax; we throw out the Btu tax. We talk about thousands and thousands of jobs lost. We do not have it yet. We did not talk about the earned income tax credit, about those who make less than \$3,000 getting \$2,400 a year credit. That eliminates cost and shoves it where it ought to be.

And so I hope we can bring out our remarks here -- we have at least another hour -- as they relate to registering to vote. I hope we can keep it in that confinement.

I just wanted to draw our attention here to the fact we are not talking about the national service program today for education.

The Senator is worried about a young person, a member of your family, having an opportunity to go to school, and what he or she has to do is put in a little service for the government -- local or State -- and get a credit for that. I do not understand why we do not want to help people, and why all we get is resistance; they are against everything.

But I will say one thing. The Senator from Texas [Mr. Gramm] said that if it was just motor-voter -- you just register to vote when you got your driver's license -- he would be for that. Oh, he would be for that; this bill would be a good one. But he does not want the disadvantage. He wants to play on fear and no on hope.

I yield the floor, Madam President.

Mr. BOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. Murray). The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Madam President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the very thoughtful debate and discussion today. My colleague from Oklahoma talked about his prior service in the private sector, and he expressed some very strong concerns about the mandates that we are putting on business. I think that is something we do need to be concerned about.

I say to my good friend from Kentucky, who just mentioned the earn-income tax credit, frankly, that is one of the entitlement programs, mandated programs, that is growing so rapidly along with health care that it is about to break the budget of the Federal Government. I join my colleague from Oklahoma as one of those who seriously things we ought to be curbing spending; we ought to be curbing unnecessary mandates.

I wanted to speak about this voter registration measure that is before us today because I came to this body with a background in State government. One of the reasons I felt it was important, one of the things I sought to achieve by running for office, by running for the Senate, was to do something about mandates which are being put on State and local governments.

We have seen over the years an explosion of mandated programs, benefits that people in Congress think ought to be provided by States and by local governments. Having served both in State government and in the Federal Government, I suggest the Federal Government does not have any wisdom that is necessarily far superior to that in State capitals and general assemblies and legislatures of America.

I believe that while we have adopted laws to make sure States and localities do not discriminate against voting, by and large, we have a very good system which differs from State to State, as it should, because we do have a Federal system under which certain responsibilities have been left to the States.

Now, however, we have this wonderful idea that Congress ought to mandate where people register to vote. Many county clerks, clerks of the county commission, which are local elected officials, have told me they do not need more problems; they do not need more hassle. They want to make sure people are registered to vote, but they are also very

concerned that only people qualified to vote register, that they only vote one time, and they only register one time. We have seen in too many areas across this country, in too many instances, that vote fraud still occurs.

A good friend of mine on the other side of the aisle, the former Governor of New Jersey, told a story that I love. He said he had a friend who was very active in politics, and he was dying of a terminal illness. He told his friend, he said, "Bury me in Jersey City. I want to continue to be active in politics and continue to vote after I'm gone."

My State of Missouri has instances, too many instances in the recent past, where voter irregularities occurred. We have set up a system -- it is not perfect -- in our State for voter registration. We have a secretary of state who is responsible for the voting in the electoral process in our State.

Our very able former secretary of state, Roy Blunt, visited me in Washington several times in the last couple of years to say how strongly he opposed an effort by the Federal Government to say we are going to mandate a whole new series of voter registration places. He talked about the burdens and the costs. And there will be costs, because we are going to be duplicating and duplicating and duplicating, many times over, the recordkeeping that is necessary when all of these different

[*S5693] government agencies are supposedly handing out voter registrations.

It is going to put a significant burden on the county clerks in my State and the election boards in the major communities to make sure they bring back and collate and coordinate all of the separate registration information that has been made in all of these different government agencies.

Does anyone think the people who man these agencies, the driver's licenses or the welfare offices, the public assistance offices, do not have enough to do? Frankly, I think they have more than enough to do. Many of them are overburdened because of limited budgets.

They have important responsibilities. That is why we set them up. We set them up to provide driver's licenses. We set them up to provide for public assistance. That is their purpose. If they have time on their hands and they do not have enough to do, we ought to eliminate the positions, because we are appropriating scarce State and local dollars to fund these agencies. Some of the driver's license offices in my State are operated by individuals on a contract basis.

These are private individuals. They would be voter registrars too? How much more are we going to pay them for that job? They get paid for performing the public service of providing drivers' licenses. They are not getting paid to register voters. Will the State have to come up with additional money for the voter registrations?

All in all we are talking about significant new mandates that are going to take time away from officials and private sector individuals and in license-free offices who have other responsibilities.

Why? All in the hope that maybe we can encourage more registration.

Two years ago the St. Louis Post Dispatch, which normally takes a very liberal democratic viewpoint -- generally they do not agree, they and I do not agree on much of anything, they have really taken off after Republicans in this Congress. I am sure my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would enjoy reading many of the things they have said about us. But in this instance, I think April 26, 1991, they had some good points. They had an editorial headed "Easing Voter Registration For What?" To quote from the editorial:

A bill in the U.S. Senate would order States to allow people to register to vote when they apply for a driver's license. The bill also would require States to make voter registration applications available at public places, including unemployment, public offices, schools and libraries. The full Senate must weigh this bill's major drawbacks --

I emphasize major drawbacks --
against its minuscule benefits.

I repeat, "minuscule benefits." To continue the quote:

There is no denying that this proposal has strong political appeal, especially among Democrats who apparently feel that revamping registration methods and procedures would boost voter turnout. The idea of making it easier for people to register is a fine one. But there ought to be concern about the way this bill would permit the Federal Government to usurp a responsibility that has been left to the States.

Let me insert parenthetically here that this is an editorial board that loves generally to see the Federal Government usurp local authority. Here they raise the very valid question that it is usurping State and local authority.

To return to the editorial:

There is no proof that making registration easier would mean a jump in voter turnout. In most political jurisdictions in Missouri and Illinois, for example, voter registration is relatively easy and convenient. But that has not changed the tendency of thousands to stay away from the polls. That tendency means the Senate bill is a political pipe dream. Its sponsors apparently have yet to get the message that many people fail to register and to vote either because they feel candidates are full of self-serving baloney, or because people assume that the election of one candidate over another will make little difference.

Low voter turnout, moreover, may well be due to the hours and days elections are held. The turnout might be higher if voting were extended into the evening or if the elections were held on Sundays, perhaps, or even over a 2-day period. Many of the real causes of public apathy on election day will not be fixed simply by making registration itself easier.

Madam President, there you have it: This bill is a solution in search of a problem.

My friend from Kentucky cited a statement by Senator Gramm of Texas who said earlier today that he would not mind if registration were made available through driver's license offices. I would object to requiring even that. I do not think that we have the duty or the responsibility or the necessity of trying a massive new redirection of State and local voter registration efforts. This is a mandate. This is a burdensome duty put on the backs of State officials and of local officials, all to no purpose.

I have to believe that the selection of welfare and public assistance offices is politically motivated. Certainly anybody who has been in politics knows that the best way to win an election, I think Abraham Lincoln said, was identify those who are going to vote for you, make sure they are registered or make sure they are qualified, and get them to the polls on election day. I think it is fairly accepted wisdom among pollsters and others who look at voter preferences that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle might feel justifiably that they would gain more votes than they would lose if they could get everybody who goes to the public assistance office to vote.

That is not what we ought to be about. We ought not to be about trying to skew election results. The Senator from Texas also talked about why we do not mandate voter registration in tax collection offices. He used the phrase "those who are pulling the wagon" to describe those who pay the taxes. They are paying the taxes to support the country, to support the State and local governments, to support the Federal Government. But are we mandating that they have registration available through the tax offices? No. I think that we are about a little bit of political one upmanship.

This measure, to me, smacks of an effort not to deal with serious problems of the country, but to try to get a little bit of partisan advantage. I am opposed to it. I think when we look at voter turnout, we can see that it is the interest that is generated in the election that gets people out, that gets people registered. And to the extent that we have elections where people do not feel the candidates make any difference -- they may not even like the candidates -- they are not going to turn out to vote.

In 1992, according to a release from the Department of Commerce that came out on Wednesday of this week, the Census Bureau finds that voter turnout for the Presidential election for 1992 was the largest since 1972. The author of Voting Registration in the Election of November 1992 says:

Sixty-one percent of the voting-age population said they went to the polls in 1992, the highest turnout recorded in the current population survey since the elections of 1972.

We have had years when there have been high turnouts; 1964 had a 69.3 percent turnout. That was a very hotly-contested election. It fell a little bit in 1967 to 68.7 percent; in 1972 it fell to 63 percent; and then in 1976, 1980, and 1984, it fell to 59 percent-plus. In 1988, it was down to 57.4 percent; but in 1992, it came back up to 61.3 percent.

I guess one could look at politics and analyze the demographics or look at the fact that there were three candidates in the race for President. That might have turned out the vote. But basically we get down to the fact that we need to have good candidates talking about real issues that affect us. That is what brings people to the polls. That is what makes people turn out to vote. They want us to be talking about problems that are of real concern to the country. They are concerned about the deficit. They are concerned about the economy.

I traveled throughout my State last year asking people what they were concerned about, and usually they were concerned about taxes, they were concerned about the economy, they were concerned about the future of agriculture. Not once did anybody at any place I went say, gee, it is so hard to register, we cannot get people out to register and thus we cannot get people to vote.

That is not the problem. We have a solution and no problem. I think that this is a solution designed to achieve a political result. Madam President, I think we ought to be worrying about more important things. In less than a week, I read about the deaths of three young children. A 2-year-old was beaten by a stepfather. One was run over by

[*S5694] a cab driver in New York. An 11-month-old apparently starved to death here in Washington, DC. I will soon submit for the Record an article from the Washington Post of May 5, entitled "A Short Life Slips Away; Baby's Starvation Leaves Troubling Questions."

There is evidence to suggest that this young baby had a serious illness. Despite the illness, the mother never sought medical attention. He died at 11 months of age, and weighed only 9 pounds.

This is a tragic, tragic story. It raises the questions about the society we live in. How is it possible that a mother, who apparently cared for her children, and a grandmother, who lived nearby, did not seek medical attention for a child literally wasting away?

Our children live in a society that glamorizes sex and violence; teenagers become pregnant, and our children spend less time with their parents than ever before. We ought to be talking about dealing with some of those problems and challenges. We ought not be devoting our time to attempting to gain partisan advantage through the registration process. That is why I feel this measure is not an appropriate one for this body to be debating. I think we ought to be talking about some of the things we can do to strengthen and preserve families, for example.

In the last 20 years, I have fought for women, infants, and children: Access to prenatal care; child care for latchkey kids; family leave; and the Parents as Teachers Program, which I think is vitally important. I think we ought to turn our attention to areas where Government policies can strengthen families.

A measure dealing with voter registration is not what we ought to be about. Those social service agencies that are providing assistance to families ought to be worrying about a child starving to death. Obviously, they did not get out and reach this family.

We are talking about putting an additional burden on the workers and on those offices, telling them that now, in addition to dealing with these terribly wrenching problems of children and dysfunctional families, where parents do not know how to take care of their child or where to take their child for assistance, we want to put another burden on them by telling them they must be voter registers. I think that is the wrong way to go.

Certainly, we ought to educate people about voting. We ought to encourage people to vote. But we do not need to use public assistance to do that. I think there are better ways of assisting families and helping their children.

I mentioned the Parents as Teachers Program. I have talked about it on this floor before. This is a parent education program to help them deal with their children as they are in the first 3 critical years of their lives. The program provides home visitations and screenings. I happen to think that the visits of parent educators to the home of Thomas might have helped get Thomas into an assisted program of health care.

But we are talking about making these people who go out and reach out to families in need worry about getting them registered.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BOND. I am happy to yield.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I wonder if the Senator would yield to the manager of this bill, because it is my clear understanding that there are no responsibilities at all placed on the social workers or employees. My understanding is that there will be forms available; if somebody asks for it, to take it.

I wonder if the Senator will yield to the Senator from Kentucky, because he is raising an issue which I think is a nonissue in this bill.

Mr. BOND. Madam President, I appreciate the question that the Senator from California has raised. But I point out again that we are asking that the offices be utilized for voter registration. These tasks are not simple tasks; they are tasks that require time and effort. And putting a new burden on the people who man these offices is not an appropriate way to utilize their time. I happen to think that utilizing these offices takes away from the responsibilities that they already have.

I think that we have many, many problems in this country that needs to be dealt with through social service agencies. I do not feel that we need to be making voter registers out of the people who work out of public service offices. I do not think we ought to be imposing burdens on motor vehicle license offices to be the registers of voters. We have plenty of responsibilities and challenges that must be met through the public service agencies that we have today.

I go back to my basic point, which is that this is likely to lead to fraud in votes; it imposes additional requirements. There is no question that having multiple sites for registration is going to increase the costs of the election officials in each body, which are going to have to collate all of the information, check it, verify it; and people who they do not know are going to be involved in the voter registration process. The normal checks and balances, in many instances, are going to be bypassed.

That is why I think this bill, as I said, is a solution in search of a problem. We have a lot more important problems in this country than to have the Federal Government interfering in the electoral process that is run, and run better than we can run it from Washington, by officials who have that responsibility in State and local governments today.

That is why I urge my colleagues not to accept this measure.

I ask unanimous consent that the article I referred to earlier in my remarks be printed in the Record.

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

A SHORT LIFE SLIPS AWAY -- BABY'S STARVATION LEAVES TROUBLING QUESTIONS

(By Tracy Thompson)

The last photo taken of Thomas McNeil shows him at 9 months, cradled in the arms of the woman who would later be accused of killing him -- his mother.

Taken in a bare apartment in the Potomac Gardens public housing complex, the picture shows a tiny baby with huge, sad eyes and stick-like limbs, so thin he might be a child in some famine-ravaged country. His three siblings are also in the photo, looking healthy and well fed. And the two women in the picture -- Thomas's mother and grandmother -- are smiling proudly.

In April, less than a month after that snapshot was taken, Thomas was dead and his 22-year-old mother, Sandra Owensby, was charged with involuntary manslaughter. Police and autopsy reports accused her of killing her baby by the most incremental and brutal of means: starving him to death.

The photo is unsettling in the way that all pictures of the recently dead are. But it becomes all the more eerie because it captures in a portrait the details that continue to haunt Thomas's much-publicized death.

Police believe they've chased the ghosts. Thomas, they contend, starved under his mother's care.

But a reexamination of Thomas's short life raises as many questions as it answers. And many of the questions spring from that photo.

Could a mother starve one of her children, while the others were healthy? Would a mother proudly show off a child she was neglecting? Did Thomas have a genetic disease that bypassed his half brothers and half sister but might have led to his death? Did he receive medical care? Did he receive enough? And how could he starve with so many people looking on?

Thomas McNeil wasted away in a complex where neighbors played with him and watched him in his stroller, alongside two healthy brothers and a sister. He perished before the eyes of a mother who sporadically took her children for doctors' visits and had baby cereal and juice in the house on the day of his death.

Yet an autopsy revealed that the 10-month-old infant weighed only 10 pounds -- less than some newborns -- when he died April 2, and it found not a trace of even partially digested food in his body. Some of his organs already had begun to decompose, the report said.

Without, a doubt, Thomas McNeil starved. The question is: How?

The answer to that question may now lie within the coils of the legal system; Owensby is scheduled to appear for a hearing today in D.C. Superior Court, where a judge will determine whether there is enough evidence against her to present the case to a grand jury. To police, it is an obvious case of criminal child abuse, of a type that is rare but not unheard of. According to the D.C. medical examiner's office, two children younger than 6 starved to death in the District in 1991, and last year one child suffered that fate.

But Owensby is just as adamant that she never harmed her son, a baby she described as sickly from the time he was born two months prematurely, and one who always had a hard time keeping food down.

Confronted with the autopsy five days after her baby's death, Owensby said, she tried to kill herself by jumping off a bridge. Since her suicide attempt, she has spent several weeks as a patient at St. Elizabeths Hospital, undergoing treatment for depression.

[*S5695] Police arrested her on the hospital grounds April 15, and she was released on her own recognizance with two conditions: that she continue treatment and that she visit her children only in supervised settings.

A retracing of Thomas's short life uncovers some facts that do not fit with a simple story of child abuse.

Owensby's three other children, ages 18 months, 3 1/2 and 6, were examined by a doctor on the day of Thomas's death and found to be healthy, according to an assistant to the Northeast Washington pediatrician who examined them. (There are now in foster care and were unavailable for interviews.)

Until Thomas began teething, his mother breast-fed him, said Connie Rice, the baby's grandmother, who shared her apartment with Owensby and the children. Rice said the baby was fed formula as he aged and was given some solid food in an attempt to find a meal he wouldn't vomit.

In addition, a next-door neighbor said Owensby sometimes borrowed milk from her for the baby. A police officer in the apartment on the day of the baby's death saw a box of baby cereal in the refrigerator; a reporter who visited several days later saw two jars of unopened baby food in the pantry. And the Northeast Washington pediatrician has records showing Owensby brought Thomas and her other three children in for medical care, though only occasionally.

Pediatric specialists, who spoke from their experience but no firsthand knowledge of Thomas's case, say those facts, combined with the baby's rapid decline, raise the possibility that Thomas suffered from a congenital intestinal defect or from cystic fibrosis, a genetic disorder of the body's mucous membranes that often becomes active at about 5 months of age.

"Any time you have a youngster who doesn't thrive, who doesn't gain weight, who has pulmonary problems, you have to think about cystic fibrosis," said Ronald Kleinman, chief of pediatric gastroenterology and nutrition at Massachusetts General Hospital and chairman of the American Academy of Pediatrics Committee on Nutrition. "Another possibility is that this youngster did have a malabsorption" problem.

A shy young woman with a ready smile, Owensby has lived in the Washington area for most of her life. According to her mother, she left school in the seventh or eighth grade. Court records show that Owensby has no criminal record in the Washington area and that she showed no evidence of drug use at the time of her arrest.

In person, she seems by turns distraught with grief and unaware of the gravity of her situation. At her son's funeral on April 17, she spent most of the service outside, wordlessly pacing around the hearse as tears ran down her face. But two days earlier, she had smilingly greeted a reporter at the hospital, saying she had been enjoying old movies "because my doctor wants me to do a lot of activities."

Thomas was difficult to feed, she said, because he vomited often. He had always been small, she said, and though he ate "a lot" and gained weight, "it was in his belly, not his arms. All my kids are skinny, but they're not malnourished."

He also had chronic diarrhea and asthma, she said. Ventolin, a medication sometimes prescribed for asthma, was in her apartment, and the prescription was for Thomas. But, she said, she considered those routine childhood ailments -- until the morning of April 2, when he began wheezing as he lay next to her in bed. Then, she said, Thomas stopped breathing. Paramedics could not revive him.

Owensby gave several accounts of her son's medical care.

Records at Children's Hospital show that the baby was a patient in August 1992. Spokeswoman Barbara Cire said hospital rules prevented her from releasing the details of his stay, but Owensby said her son had a hernia operation at Children's when he was 3 or 4 months old.

Records in the office of Ilnez Hinds, a Northeast Washington pediatrician, show Thomas was seen there three times before his May 9, 1992, birth and Nov. 15, 1992. Ponsella Poindexter, a medical assistant to Hinds, said that Thomas was seen for routine illnesses and shots; records show that as of Nov. 10, 1992, he weighed 14 pounds -- small, but within the range on standard pediatric growth charts for a baby born two months prematurely. On his last visit, Poindexter said, "we saw progress."

Poindexter said Thomas was not tested for cystic fibrosis because there was no reason at the time to believe he was seriously ill. Hinds gave Owensby an appointment to bring Thomas back in January, Poindexter said, "but then she dropped out of sight" and Hinds' office couldn't find her.

Owensby said she took Thomas to Dennis Wirt, a pediatrician in Southeast Washington, after she quarreled with Thomas' father and moved out of his apartment in December 1992. Wirt said his records show that he had seen her other children in June 1990, nearly two years before Thomas was born; Wirt said he never met Thomas.

Owensby also said that during Thomas' last months, she took him several times to the pediatric emergency room at D.C. General Hospital. But hospital spokesman Rockefeller Twyman said records show Thomas was seen there only once, in October 1992.

Immediately after the baby's death, Owensby said, the baby's father blamed her.

He thought I starved the baby," she said. "But he knows I wouldn't do that. ... You know how people get mad, they take it out on anybody." The man she identified as Thomas's father did not respond to two letters and several telephone calls.

Although Owensby said she did not notice anything seriously amiss during her son's last months, some of her neighbors did.

Albirtha Leonard, who lives next door to Connie Rice's apartment, said Owensby sometimes came over to borrow milk for Thomas and to use her phone because Owensby didn't have one. Leonard said she overheard Owensby make doctor appointments for her children.

Leonard also recalled holding Thomas about a month before his death and noticing that he was very thin and that he could not hold his head upright.

When she hoisted him onto her shoulder, his head would "go off to the left." When she shifted him to the other side, his head would flop again, Leonard said.

If Thomas had cystic fibrosis, it could have been inherited or the result of a spontaneous genetic mutation, said Jerome Paulson, an associate professor of pediatrics at George Washington University School of Medicine. Its first signs are often lung problems, failure to thrive and foul-smelling diarrhea, specialists said.

Owensby and her mother, in separate interviews, said Thomas showed all of those signs as well as another. When they kissed him, they noticed a bitter, salty taste to his skin, a trait the pediatric specialists say could have stemmed from abnormal body chemistry.

Beyond genetic defects, infections or a parasitic ailment might explain Thomas's problems, Kleinman and Paulson said.

"All these things you have raised confound the accusation that she starved the baby to death," Kleinman said. "It seems much more likely, given the history of diarrhea and vomiting, this was a baby ... whose needs for nutrition just couldn't be met through the usual kind of efforts. That doesn't absolve her, of course, because most mothers, seeing their babies turn into little stick figures, demand some kind of medical attention."

Paulson agreed. "It must have been clear to somebody that this kid was not doing well," he said. "Why didn't he get back to a doctor?"

In the end, some of the responsibility for Thomas McNeil's death may rest with his community, said Marilyn Riley, acting director of the District's Child and Family Services Division. "It's important that a community responds when they see a questionable situation," she said. "By the time we are getting a complaint or information, it's already happened. But there are neighbors, other people, other relatives, who may see something is not quite right here. I think the responsibility lies with all of us. And somehow this child went unnoticed."

The disclosure of the full medical examiner's report may answer some of the questions surrounding Thomas's death. But that is not expected for several months, said Joe Conte, Owensby's attorney.

A jury may have to face a far more difficult question: What is a parent's duty to her child -- even if he has a serious illness the parent does not see?

Mrs. BOXER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I had the privilege of sitting in the chair during this debate, and all of the sudden, I had a sense of *deja vu*, as I was sitting in the chair presiding over what I thought was a discussion of the motor-voter

bill -- and I was looking forward to the opportunity to vote on this bill that was debated for 12 legislative days. Every amendment offered by the Republicans was listened to, voted upon, and many were taken by the manager here, the distinguished whip, the Senator from Kentucky, who is trying to build a consensus here -- I sat where the Presiding Officer is -- so we could move this bill forward, and so we do not have another cloture vote; so we can move this country forward. What this bill is about is expanding the franchise so that more and more American citizens will participate in our democracy.

As I sat there, I became amazed, because here we go again, Madam President: another filibuster. We heard about every issue under the Sun from the Senator from Oklahoma, who had to be reminded that at this time we are supposed to be discussing this bill, at least for the next 3 hours.

So I think what we are facing here today is another delay. The first time you delay, you can say you did it on principle. And the second time, you begin to wonder if this is not some strategy which is being put forward by a minority of this U.S. Senate -- by the Republican minority -- to stop us from moving ahead.

I have great respect for every Member of this great body, and I respect their opposition to this bill. But, frankly, I do not understand it. It is so

[*S5696] simple. It is so important that we become more inclusive.

When we started this Republic, only men of property could vote. As you and I well know, Madam President, you could not be in that seat, and I could not be standing here today. We could not even vote. And, frankly, some of the men in this body could not even vote, because if they did not have property, they were disenfranchised.

But this country is one that reaches out to its people, and in their wisdom, we saw legislators throughout the years expand the franchise. It was expanded so that men -- I should say white men -- who did not have property could vote; so we had more diversity. And then we had men of color granted the right to vote. And then, finally, Madam President, a day that we celebrate, certainly, in 1920 women got the right to vote; and the franchise was expanded. And then 18-year-olds had the right to vote, because we said if young Americans can die for their country, they should be able to vote for the leaders of this country.

The bill that the Senator from Kentucky brings us today is really following in a long line of expanding the franchise. Now it will be easier to register. Yes, if somebody goes to a Federal agency, it should be easier. Maybe she does not drive, or maybe it is difficult for them, but they can find a piece of paper, fill it out, and vote.

I am very sad to see people oppose this bill. I respect them for opposing it. But I have to ask, what are they afraid of? Are they afraid of the people?

Maybe they are happy, because there is a 40-percent turnout in their State, or a 50-percent turnout. I will be happy, Madam President, when there is a 90-percent turnout and when everyone who is able to register is registered.

Maybe it will hurt me. Maybe those people will not vote for me. But I am not afraid of the people. I am not afraid of the people. I want them to make a judgment on who I am.

But perhaps there are some people around here on the other side of the aisle who are afraid. They like it the way it is.

The highest turnout areas are those populated by the wealthiest among us. Let us face it. And the wealthiest among us, those who earn over \$150,000, \$200,000 a year, for the most part vote Republican. Are they afraid to expand the franchise to others? I ask that question. But regardless of how they answer it, this bill ought to be considered. There have been 12 days of debate and a conference. The House came together with the Senate. Let us move this process forward. Instead, I hear my Republican colleagues: We should be talking about children. We should be talking about family. We should be talking about the environment and jobs. Of course we should.

I would hasten to remind them that it is because of them that we were not able to vote to improve the lives of families. We were not able to vote to improve the lives of the people in this country, the workers in this country. They did not let us vote on a jobs bill, Madam President. If the minority of this U.S. Senate wants to vote against this report, God bless them. If they want to vote against this bill, God bless them. I respect them. I respect their opinion. But let us move the business of this Nation forward.

So, in summary, I was not going to participate in this debate. But as I sat there I had this sense of unease, Madam President, that again we are going to see a delay, a delay on a bill that was fairly presented, that was open to amendment, and a bill that will expand the franchise, the voting rights of the greatest democracy on Earth.

I yield back the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. FORD. Madam President, I thank the distinguished Senator from California for her eloquence and support, and agree with her comments.

Madam President, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Bond], who spoke earlier, quoted Abraham Lincoln. Now Abraham Lincoln was born in my State. Kentucky is the home of Abraham Lincoln. We cherish his Presidency and what he was able to do for this country.

I would like to quote Abraham Lincoln, too, if I may. I believe Abraham Lincoln said in 1862:

The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew.

I think that is where we are today. The distinguished Senator from California talked about the progression of those who had an opportunity to vote, and it happened here. Basically, it started at the grassroots. That is where this bill comes from, the grassroots. It has arrived at this level that is so important.

We understand what is going on here. We have worked 12 days. I have sat here, and in conference, I might add, in addition to that. We worked hard to put the bill together. Now here it is back on the floor, passed by the House and we find that we are being unable to bring it to a vote.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. Bond] also said that we should not put pressure on the States from this advantage point. Let me just ask a question: What if everyone eligible in the State of Missouri went to the office and registered to vote? What would they do? What would happen to them? They would probably come to the Federal Government and ask for money. That is what would happen. So, if we allow the States to carry through -- 27 of them now, I believe, have something similar to this piece of legislation, not much change.

The distinguished occupant of the chair, her Secretary of State was eloquent; I do not know whether he is Democrat or Republican but, boy, when he came before the Rules Committee he knew what he was talking about. He had the answers. He understood, and it was a strong advocate of the motor-voter procedure.

Now, we hear a lot about mandating, proposing, and spending money. My distinguished colleague from Oklahoma, a few moments ago, Senator Nickles, talked about voting against this, and voting against that, and how much it is going to cost, and so forth. It was not hard for him to vote against the reduction of the funding for the superconducting super collider. He voted to spend all that money. And I have the dates here that he voted on that. And we had Senator Bumpers from Arkansas had an amendment that prohibits obligation of funds for the superconducting super collider after June 1, 1993, unless the President certified to Congress that commitments from contributions from international sources meet or exceed, we were told, about \$650 million, but the Senator from Oklahoma voted against that motion.

How many billions did he vote for? And then we look at the Bumpers amendment which reduces the committee reported funding of \$2.1 billion for the space station by \$1.6 billion. It did not wipe it out but reduced it by \$1.6 billion. But the Senator from Oklahoma voted for keeping the billions in. Keep the billions in. And it just goes on and on. Madam President, about SDI, just to reduce it a few million dollars he voted against that. So we go on and on.

It is just what you want and what you call pork. To some people pork is their pork and our beef. But when it comes to the superconducting super collider and spending billions, oh, he is standing out here fighting for it. When we want to give the individual the right to vote and to assist, he is opposed to it.

To vote on a space station, spend billions of dollars, that is all right. But if you want to give an individual the right to vote, he is against that because it would cost a few bucks maybe. That just does not make sense. I do not understand it. Maybe I am not supposed to.

But I say to my friend from Missouri, he was a Governor; I was a Governor.

I probably had the most unique experience in voter registration of any Governor when we wiped the slate clean. Every registered voter was taken off the rolls. They said, "You are crazy. We have more voters in X County than we have people." Well, we need to wipe that off the rolls.

We reregistered anybody that wanted to register. And you know, instead of having fewer, we had more, because we expanded the opportunity for people to vote. We encouraged the county clerks to register people. In fact, we paid them so much per registered voter in

[*S5697] order to offset their expenses. The State did it.

Let me ask you: Why are the States so worried? What if every eligible voter in my State went to the courthouse and registered? What would happen?

Well, they would have to have ballots printed, more of them. That is one thing. They would have to print labels, maybe, for the ballot. They will have to mail out more absentee ballots. They would have to provide a few more polling places. But we would not hear anything about that.

They say, 60 percent of the registered voters, fine; or 60 percent of the eligible voters, fine. What about the other 40 percent?

This bill does not mandate people to vote. It does not even guarantee that we will have a higher turnout. But it does guarantee that at least every eligible voter in this country has an opportunity to register to vote.

There are no mandates here that they have to go to the polls. I think an individual has just as much right not to vote as they do to vote. That is their right. So when they say this bill is not going to increase the voter turnout, I agree with that. It is not a mandate for turnout.

But it is like I have said many times: You watch baseball. Everybody is watching baseball now. I like to listen to the Orioles play. I thought they were going to win the other night. They were behind 4 to 1, and they scored a couple other runs. It wound up 4 to 3.

They had a good pitching game the other night. The pitcher did a terrific job. They won about 8 to 1, or something like that.

I like it, but I am not interested too much. I do not go up to the ball games. Maybe I will get them on TV. I look at the paper every morning to see how the teams turned out.

But as we get closer to the division championships, it whets my appetite; I begin to watch it a little bit closer. Then, when they have the division championships and my team is in it, I watch; I have an interest. And then if my team goes to the World Series, boy, I want to go. I want to go watch my team play in the World Series, but I do not have a ticket and I cannot get it, so I cannot watch it.

Now, why did I say that? We have a good political campaign. We talk about the issues. As the distinguished Senator from Missouri said, we have good candidates talking about real problems. The people became interested. They want to go vote.

But, lo and behold, they forgot to register; or it was too much trouble to go from the workplace; too late to get there. I work and you work and everybody else works about the time the courthouse is open. We go to work when they open and we come home when they close, so we do not have a chance to go.

So with good candidates talking about real problems, as the Senator from Missouri said, it whets our appetite and we become encouraged to go to the polls and vote for a candidate. And they find that they are not registered to vote.

I was surprised at my friend from Missouri saying that he was even opposed to registering by driver's license. The leader of the Republican political senatorial campaign said he had no objections to registering by driver's license. But, yet, here comes a former Governor -- and I am surprised a former Governor would be against registering to vote in some easier fashion.

I dealt with my county clerks. I worked with my county clerks. They needed help to improve. We have all computers now in our State. It is going very well.

But we say: How many people got excited about the last election? And we had the largest turnout we have had in many, many years. How many wanted to vote and could not? Would it have changed the election? I do not know. But you have to take your chances.

We are talking about checking lobbyists. We did that here yesterday. We are talking about helping people to register to vote, reconnecting the American people to Government. Then we are talking about campaign finance reform.

What more, in my opinion, could we do in order to help the American people be more of a part of their Government?

Some say, "Well, we are going to register too many Democrats. They are poor and all Republicans are rich." That is the reason they worry about not going to the tax office and having mandated forms there.

Well, I suspect most people that go to the tax office have a car and they have a driver's license and they are registered to vote; that is, 90 percent of all those eligible in this country have a driver's license.

So the disadvantaged, instead of playing on their fear, we ought to play on their hopes and their dreams and their desire to be a part of this Government.

The argument against incurring costs for an expanded voter registration role is distressful to me -- distressful. The funds that have been expended to register those citizens on the rolls is OK, it is all right, but, to opponents of the bill, it seems it is wrong to expend funds to bring new citizens into the election process; again, expending funds to bring new voters into the system. What a commentary on democracy. What a commentary on democracy.

So I hope that, in the words of my friend from California, Senator Boxer, we respect those that are opposed to this legislation, but I hope that a small group would not prevent us from getting on with the legislation here on the floor.

I have worked awfully hard on this piece of legislation over the years, as everyone knows. I have used a little Henry Clay. Most people know that Henry Clay was recognized as the great compromiser. Henry Clay said compromise was a negotiated hurt.

And I hurt a little when I negotiated some of these, because I had a very, very strong feeling that we ought to do everything we could to reconnect the American citizen to its Government.

As a result of this bill, maybe many in this Chamber will be gone, be defeated. That is a chance we have to take. The more people that vote, the greater democracy we have, because we are listening to the people.

I believe it was Hamilton who said, referring to the House -- but it also applies to the Senate: "Here, sir, the people govern; here they act by their immediate representatives." That is what I am. I am supposed to be listening to the people. And this bill is not something that was dreamed up here in this Chamber, not something that was dreamed up here in Washington. It is a grassroots effort.

We hear that this elected official is against it, this elected official is against it, this group of elected officials is against it, this group of elected officials is against it -- but the associations of people are for it. From church groups, to the disabled, to the blind, labor, NAACP -- these people, these groups of people are for this legislation -- the League of Women Voters. They are very strong leaders bringing it up from the grassroots. They are nonpartisan.

Even the distinguished Senator from Texas said awhile ago, it was negligible whether this would benefit either party or not, the whole bill. So why are we making it partisan? Why can we not just go on and vote?

I just believe, if you listen to what is said, there is some fear underlying the refusal to let us go ahead and vote. There is some fear. And I do not know what there is to fear in the American people. What is there to fear in the American people? They speak, and should speak loudly. We should give them every opportunity to say, whoever sits in that chair or that chair, I had an opportunity to vote for or against him or her. So that is the opportunity we are trying to give here today. And I hope we can get about our business here and stop delay.

We are delaying everything. This is 12 days on this particular bill, days of labor in the conference committee. Basically all of the core amendments offered by the other side are in this bill. It is not identical, but worked out in a struggle with the House. I think everybody who was associated with the conference and discussed it with me understands I fulfilled my obligation to the best of my ability. Maybe I was not good enough, but I did everything I could to accommodate my friends on the other side. And the admission by the Republican leader this morning, I thought, was reassuring; that the bill is better because it has these things in it. But he still did not like it.

[*S5698]

I do not believe we could do anything to have it be embraced. But I was encouraged that 90 percent of the bill was approved by the chairman of the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee on this floor today; 90 percent of what this bill does was approved. So the 10 percent, that is the fear. That is the fear that they are trying to spread:

Those people on welfare -- be concerned about them, be fearful of them. Be fearful of those who are disadvantaged. Be fearful of those who are disabled, that we give an opportunity to be registered to vote.

I am sure all of those who are on welfare do not want to be there. They want to be better off. And some of them will be one of these days, if we do what is right.

I hope and pray every day that I do what is right in this Chamber, and in committee, and in the positions I take. I made a statement one time to a bunch of press people who wrote a kind editorial about me. You do not get many of those, you know.

Somebody said, "How in the world did they write a nice editorial about you?"

I said, "Well, I kept doing what is right, and on one point we agreed." So they wrote a nice editorial.

I hope we can get on with this. We worry so much about fraud and abuse, but in those States that have this, there is no acceleration. In fact there is some reduction. The distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. Hatfield] has said that in fact it is better now that they have something similar to this in the State of Oregon. He will attest to that. So there is really no documentation that there will be any fraud or abuse.

I hope sincerely that we will have the opportunity to go ahead, be allowed to vote on this without going through a cloture vote again, having it delayed for 2 or 3 more days, and things of that nature. It is important we pass this bill, in my opinion. It is important we give it the President and let him sign it. It is important we get on to other things that will give us an opportunity to say to the American people, we want to give you a chance to approve or disapprove of what we are doing; give more people an opportunity to approve or disapprove of what we are doing.

I yield the floor, Madam President.

DELETION OF DOCUMENT VERIFICATION AMENDMENT FROM MOTOR-VOTER CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the conference report before the Senate today does not contain a provision which I believe is so very important -- a provision which makes it clear that States can require documents to prove citizenship of a person applying for voter registration.

The provision did not mandate that States check documents. It merely clarified that this bill was not to be interpreted to prohibit a State from requiring documents demonstrating U.S. citizenship. This would include those States which currently -- under by State law -- check documents and those States which may wish to check documents in the future.

My colleague from Kentucky did not object to my amendment because he believed that:

Nothing in this bill *** would preclude the States from requiring presentation of documentary evidence of citizenship.

That may be true, but I am not convinced that my amendment is not needed. I offered this amendment to ensure that the States do not lose their ability to require proof of citizenship for voting.

I believe that my colleagues would agree that the States should be permitted to ask for citizenship verification, especially since all 50 States require that all who register to vote must be citizens.

Yet the conference committee chose to remove my amendment from the final bill.

The American people agree that only citizens should be allowed to vote. My office received numerous phone calls in support of my amendment.

Because of this country's generous legal immigration policies and the millions of illegal aliens present, there are many noncitizens residing in the United States. According to the Census Bureau, 15 percent of California's population are noncitizens. According to the 1991 statistical yearbook, the most current assessment by the INS of the foreign-born

population in the United States, California has about 50 percent of the Nation's immigrants, and about one-third of its refugees and asylees. Unfortunately, California also has large numbers of illegal aliens.

California does not yet require citizenship verification for voting or registering to vote, but it may some day decide that it must do so to protect the integrity of its elections. My amendment will ensure that California can do so.

Some assert that my amendment would undermine the mail-in registration provisions of the bill. My amendment does not require any State to do anything. States can legislate that only voter registration applications made in person require documentation, or all first-time voters in the State must register in person and show documentation. The State does not even have to address citizenship documentation for mail-in registrations. A State can also ask for a photocopy of a document proving citizenship with mail-in applications.

While I would not encourage photocopies of documents -- since this might encourage the reproduction of fraudulent documents -- my amendment does not restrict nor instruct States as to how, when, why, or whether to require citizenship documentation. It merely says that they may if they wish.

It is interesting that so many of the groups find my amendment objectionable -- most odd, since it does not mandate anything.

Some argue that States could ask for identification only from foreign looking or sounding people. It's certainly possible that States do that now -- without my amendment -- but my amendment does not in any way promote such behavior.

I have been in the middle of this identification issue before. The employer sanctions provisions of the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act requires that employers check documents from workers in order to ensure that the workers are authorized to work. All employees, not just those who look or sound foreign, must provide documentation. All employees must provide documents to avoid discrimination against those who may seem foreign.

We even established a new office in the Department of Justice to handle discrimination complaints.

But my amendment did not give the States any more authority than they already had, and it certainly does not encourage States to check documents only of those looking or sounding foreign.

I am disappointed that the conference committee eliminated this amendment which would have ensured that the States be allowed to maintain the integrity of their elections by requiring evidence of citizenship to vote if they so desired.

Mr. HATFIELD. Section 7 of this legislation instructs the States to designate agencies to register voters in Federal Elections. States are required to provide registration opportunities at all agencies which provide public assistance and at those agencies within a State which provides State-funded programs primarily engaged in providing services to persons with disabilities. These provisions are designed to reach out to those citizens who are not likely to benefit from motor-voter registration programs -- the poor and persons with disabilities who may not have driver's license and may not come into contact with the other principal places to register under this act.

Mr. FORD. As my friend from Oregon has stated, the intent of the Congress is to extend registration opportunities to persons with disabilities through agencies which provide services such as, but not limited to, transportation, job training, education, counseling, rehabilitation or independent living services. Agencies which only incidentally provide services to people with disabilities are not mandated under this law to provide registration materials, although they certainly could if they desired. The Federal Government is directed to work with the States to identify the appropriate agencies to provide registration opportunities.

Mr. HATFIELD. I further understand that registration materials should be distributed by these agencies with each application for service or assistance, and with each recertification, renewal, or change of address form relating to the individual's contact with the agency.

[*S5699] Does this direction indicate that voter registration forms will be provided at the entry point for services offered by an agency, or at a point where an individual changes their status for services, rather than at all agencies with which the person has contact?

Mr. FORD. Yes. Once a person applies for service at an entry point and has been offered an opportunity to register to vote, if that person is subsequently referred to another agency, that agency does not have to repeat the offer to register. However, if a person receiving services has a change in status such as recertification, renewal, or change of address, the agency providing services would offer the opportunity to register. For example, if a person were to apply for vocational rehabilitation, the opportunity to register to vote would occur when the person applies initially, or moves, rather than each time the individual meets with a vocational rehabilitation counselor.

Mr. HATFIELD. I thank my colleague for his clarification of these key elements of the National Voter Registration Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. ROTH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent I be permitted to give two statements as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. FORD. Reserving the right to object, I say to the Senator I do not know if there is anybody else, but we have this bill until 1 o'clock. The Pastore rule may apply here. How long will the Senator want?

Mr. ROTH. It will take about 15 minutes, 20 minutes at most.

Mr. FORD. Really, the Senator does not have to get morning business.

Mr. ROTH. I thank my distinguished friend from Kentucky.

SUBJECT: VOTERS & VOTING (91%); LEGISLATION (90%); ELECTION LAW (90%); ELECTIONS (79%); LEGISLATIVE BODIES (79%); CONFERENCES & CONVENTIONS (79%); CAMPAIGNS & ELECTIONS (79%); REGIONAL & LOCAL GOVERNMENTS (59%); CIVIL RIGHTS (59%); POLITICAL PARTIES (59%); US FEDERAL GOVERNMENT (59%);

EXHIBIT H