

would shift about \$2 million of postage costs currently incurred by election officials to the federal government.

Motor/voter: Computer costs.—Rather than forwarding an application from the DMV to a county registrar, a possible alternative, untested thus far, would be to transmit the voter information electronically. The cost of adding registrants to a jurisdiction's list would be lower if the voter data were transferred to computer by tape or other device rather than entered by hand. Some states have indicated that they would probably implement the motor/voter requirement by switching their record-keeping from paper to computers, and arranging for electronic transfer of data from the DMV system to the voter registration system. Some state officials have suggested that record-keeping would be improved if election officials used signature digitizers to store voters' signatures on computer, but this would cost extra. Although the bill would not mandate states to computerize, in some instances states or counties might decide computerization would be the best action, even though it would require a significant one-time investment in equipment.

CBO has no information on which to base an estimate of how many counties would computerize or how many more states would create a statewide registration system. (Currently, 21 states have one.) Based on data from Election Data Services, it appears that jurisdictions already use computers to maintain lists for at least 70 percent to 80 percent of the registered voters in the country. Aside from jurisdictions that might wish to change their existing computer systems, jurisdictions could potentially purchase new equipment to computerize the remaining one-fourth of the nation's voters.

We have examined the costs of existing registration and election systems and have determined that it costs less than one dollar per voter record for a computer system. Therefore, computerizing the registration lists for the 25 million to 35 million people in jurisdictions currently without computers would probably cost less than \$25 million.

Mail in an agency registration.—Because most voters (we assume 80 percent to 90 percent) eventually would register through the motor/voter system, mail-in and agency registration would serve as alternate means for those few remaining voters who do not have a driver's license. In those states that currently provide one or both of these methods, the number of registrations received from these sources would decrease over time as voters register instead through the DMV, and would, after the first few years, eventually generate from \$5 million to \$10 million in annual savings, which would partially offset increased costs of motor/voter. If all states that currently do not have mail-in registration were to implement it along with the other two methods it would cost them \$1 million to \$2 million annually because they would not use mail-in registration as much as states that currently have mail-in registration do.

Almost all states report that they have some form of agency or satellite registration, which in some states means a voter has to swear an oath in front of a deputy registrar at one of several county offices. The bill envisions a somewhat expanded type of agency registration in which forms are available at a variety of locations where voters can complete and submit them (or else take

voter, the cost of such additional employees and related expenses would probably be about \$20 million annually during the first five years of implementation. Since most states require renewal of a driver's license every four years, costs would decrease in later years, because most people would have had an opportunity to register and only those who move would have to update their registration.

Motor/voter: Election official costs.—Once the DMV receives an application, it probably would forward a copy to the local election official to process the registration, as is current practice in the states that now have motor/voter. While CBO expects that officials in sparsely populated jurisdictions would be able to absorb small increases in the number of applications, others would face increased costs. In especially populous jurisdictions, election officials would have to hire more staff to handle the likely increase in applications and to check for duplicate registrations (although some states with motor/voter report these are less than they had originally anticipated). Counties we contacted report that the number of registration applications they handle annually amounts to about 20 percent of the number of registered voters in the county (there are about 130 million registered voters nationwide). Based on information from counties in states that currently have motor/voter, it appears that the workload could increase by 20 percent because of people registering who otherwise would not have registered, duplicate registrations, and ineligible applications.

Assuming the incremental cost for a county election office of handling an additional application is \$1.50, then local jurisdictions, in aggregate, would have to pay an additional \$5 million to \$10 million annually. Some of these costs would only be incurred during the first few years. Once most people are on the rolls and the number of unregistered voters decreases, use of the motor/voter system would decrease as voters would only register if they have moved.

Such costs, however, would be somewhat offset by a reduction in the cost of part-time employees hired to handle the increased workload around each registration deadline. Officials in some states with motor/voter, such as Colorado and Michigan, report that receiving forms from the DMV evenly over the year rather than in a last-minute pre-election rush has allowed them to reduce their part-time hires and use their full-time staff more efficiently. Based on information from several localities that hire part-time staff during election years, we expect local officials nationwide could save about \$10 million in a presidential election year and about \$7 million in non-presidential election years by reducing part-time hires. (There would be no savings in non-election years because no part-time help is necessary.)

The total costs that election officials would face would be offset further by the postal rate subsidy authorized by the bill. While the legislation requires election officials to notify applicants of the outcome of their registration application, it also would provide a discount of about 43 percent for notices mailed by third class. Because most states already mail such notices to applicants, the notification requirement would not result in additional costs, but the subsidy

Postal rate subsidy.—Whether election officials decide to use this NCOA approach or choose their current or other method for list cleaning (as long as it is uniform, nondiscriminatory, and does not drop for nonvoting), their postal costs associated with this process would decrease if the legislation is enacted. The bill authorizes a postal rate subsidy for mailings associated with the list cleaning requirement, thereby shifting costs from the states to the federal government. The ultimate amount of this shift would depend on the number of notices mailed. We have no data on the amount of mail election officials currently send out to update their lists. However, if most state adopt the NCOA approach, the number of changes of address, about 46 million annually, would represent the maximum possible number of matches between the registration rolls and the NCOA list. With an average third class subsidy of about 7.3 cents per piece of mail at current rates, the cost of this subsidy is unlikely to exceed \$3 million annually. In fact, it is likely to be less—probably in the vicinity of \$2 million—because not everyone on the NCOA list will be on a registration list, some changes of address are temporary only, and officials will update their lists through other methods such as motor/voter. When voters move within a state and get a new driver's license, they also would be updating their voting registration, thereby reducing the number of voters that officials will have to contact to determine whether they are recorded on the rolls accurately.

8. Estimate comparison: None.
9. Previous CBO estimate: On February 1, 1993, CBO prepared an estimate for H.R. 2, the National Voter Registration Act of 1993, as ordered reported by the Committee on House Administration on January 27, 1993. That estimate showed direct spending from the Crime Victims Fund because fines mandated by the bill would result in greater deposits into the fund. The estimate for this bill does not include any direct spending because income from fines would go into the general fund of the Treasury. The cost estimates for the two bills are otherwise identical.
10. Estimate prepared by: James Hearn, Mickey Buhl, and John Steal.
11. Estimate approved by: C.G. Nuckols, Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

REGULATORY IMPACT

Pursuant to paragraph 11(b) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee received the following information from the Federal Election Commission as to the regulatory impact of the bill, as reported by the Committee:

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION,
Washington, DC, February 25, 1993.

Hon. WENDELL H. FORD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter responds to your inquiry of February 22, 1993, regarding the probable impact of regulatory and reporting responsibilities assigned to the Federal Election Commis-

them home and mail them in). Again, this would not be a major source of registering voters, and the costs are not expected to be significant in aggregate, although some additional training costs might be necessary to expand the pool of people able to assist voters in completing the forms. Only those states that currently have just a deputy registrar system would have to print extra forms to be available throughout the jurisdiction, but these costs probably would be offset by the reduced amount of work for the registrars and clerks who would not have to register as many voters in persons.

COSTS OF VOTER CONFIRMATION PROVISIONS

Because voters usually do not notify election officials of address changes, the names and addresses of outdated registrants often accumulate on the rolls. Election officials revise registration lists to clean out those who have moved, died, or are otherwise ineligible to vote in that jurisdiction. The bill would prescribe that whatever method a state uses to maintain accurate registration rolls, it should be uniform and nondiscriminatory. Further, the bill would prohibit states from removing registrants from the list simply for not voting.

Current law.—Almost all states now employ some procedure for updating lists at least once every two years, though practices may vary somewhat from county to county. About one-fifth of the states canvass all voters on the list. The rest of the states do not contact all voters, but instead target only those who did not vote in the most recent election (using not voting as an indication that an individual might have moved). Of these, only a handful of states simply drop the non-voters from the list without notice. These states could not continue this practice under the bill.

Whether states canvass all those on the list or just the non-voters, most send a notice to assess whether the person has moved. In a majority of states, election officials also provide voters with a way to update or prevent removal from the registration list.

National change of address system.—The bill suggests, but does not require, an approach election officials can use to make sure that their list cleaning method is uniform and nondiscriminatory. Instead of using non-voting as an indication that a voter has changed addresses, an election official could contact only those who have actually moved, and at their new addresses. But using the National Change of Address (NCOA) system of the U.S. Postal Service, election officials could directly identify those who have moved and would send those people a forwardable notice with a pre-addressed, postage paid card that outlines the registration options available and allows people to respond to the officials. While an elections jurisdiction would have to pay a vendor licensed by the Postal Service to do a computer match of the registration list and the NCOA list (costing from \$2 to \$8 per 1,000 addresses matched), these costs probably would be offset by reducing the postage and printing costs that officials currently pay for less-focused canvassing. Several pilot studies of this system in California and Oregon, sometimes called Project MAIL, report that counties would save money by significantly reducing the number of notices sent out.

unquestionably placed some additional burden or many election offices. This burden would fall unevenly or local jurisdictions dependent on both the size of their populations and the extent of their computerization. We can estimate costs of such a reporting mechanism based on the model devised for the Voting Accessibility for the Elderly and Handicapped Act wherein local jurisdictions report to the State, States to the FEC, and the FEC to the Congress.

Our assumption is that such reporting would require one-half (0.5) a staff month (on average) per local jurisdiction and two staff months per State. At \$24,000 salary per person, the approximately 350 staff years would cost about \$8,400,000 per year, to be borne by State and local governments. This figure would likely decrease over time with increased computerization. Furthermore, such data would prove useful to the State and local offices as well as to political parties, the Postal Service, and the Department of Justice. Should you or your staff require any further information regarding these or other related matters, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

SCOTT E. THOMAS, *Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ROLL-CALL VOTE

In compliance with paragraph 7 (b) and (c) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the record of the rollcall vote in the Committee on Rules and Administration during its consideration of the original bill, to report it favorably, was:

Yeas—7

- Mr. Pell
- Mr. Byrd
- Mr. Moynihan
- Mr. Dodd
- Mrs. Feinstein
- Mr. Mathews
- Mr. Ford

Nays—5

- Mr. Stevens
- Mr. Helms
- Mr. Warner
- Mr. McConnell
- Mr. Cochran

Senator Stevens presented the proxy of Senator Hatfield in favor of the bill.

sion (FEC) under the terms of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993, as reported out of Committee.

At this time, we anticipate that the regulations will be limited to specifying the contents of the national mail voter registration form and the data to be collected and reported by State and local election authorities, pursuant to the reporting requirements set out in Section 9.

In response to the individual items you specified:

1. An estimate of the numbers and classes of individuals and groups who would be regulated.—The Commission estimates that its regulations and reporting requirements would, like other provisions of the bill itself, have a direct impact on approximately 8,000 State and local election officials throughout the nation who are responsible for conducting voter registration for federal elections. Tangentially affected would be the 189,000,000 persons of voting age in the United States who might come in contact with the registration process.

2. The economic impact of the regulations.—We foresee regulations pertaining only to the contents of the mail registration forms and State reporting required by the bill. The latter would have associated costs beyond that inherent in the bill itself. This is addressed under item 4 below.

3. The impact on the personal privacy of the individuals involved.—The Commission's regulations would have no impact on the personal privacy of the election officials themselves. However, certain items that might have to appear on the proposed national mail registration application form could be perceived by some members of the public as an invasion of personal privacy. Three such items are questions regarding Social Security number (required by 13 States, optional in 14 States), political party preference (required by the 26 States that conduct closed primaries) and race (required by some States in carrying out the purposes of the Voting Rights Act). These questions could be viewed as especially intrusive in States that do not require this information for voter registration purposes.

4. An estimate of the time, additional paperwork, and financial costs of recordkeeping requirements.—The Commission anticipates that minimum reporting requirements may necessitate the collection of the following data from State and local election authorities: The number, method, source, and disposition of registration applications received;

- The method, frequency, and consequences of confirming the voter registration lists;
- The number and reasons for other deletions from the voter registration lists;
- The number of persons of voting age and the percentage of those that are registered;
- The number and types of the various mailings required under the bill; and
- Costs of implementing the legislation, to include producing registration forms and other necessary materials, training, and maintaining records.

Although several jurisdictions, notably the large ones, routinely collect some or all of the data, a universal mandate to do so would

MINORITY VIEWS OF SENATORS STEVENS, HELMS, WARNER, DOLE, MCCONNELL, AND COCHRAN ON THE NATIONAL VOTER REGISTRATION ACT OF 1993

Since this issue was last debated before the full Senate, two significant developments have occurred: (1) in the 1992 general election, voter turnout increased 5 percent over 1988; and (2) the financial condition of the Federal and State governments has worsened. The first point clearly indicates that the National Voter Registration Act is not necessary to increase voter turnout. The key to increasing turnout is an electorate that feels they have something at stake and that there is a compelling reason to vote. Those elements were present in 1992.

On the second point, States, the vast majority of whom must balance their budgets, have their backs against the financial wall. The unfunded mandates established by this bill will exacerbate the situation and force many States to resort to offsets in the form of program cuts or tax increases. For them, deficit spending is not an option.

If, as the majority report contends, the costs of this bill are relatively modest, then it should not be difficult for the bill's proponents to provide funding to implement its provisions. Regardless of whose cost estimates are the most accurate, Congress should not impose this bill on the states as the latest in a long line of unfunded Federal mandates.

The National Voter Registration Act of 1993 would require State and local governments to register voters in three ways: (a) by simultaneous applications when applying for motor vehicle drivers' licenses; (b) by applications received through the mail; and (c) by applications through all public assistance, unemployment and vocational rehabilitation offices.

No hearings were held on this bill in the 103d Congress, but the Rules Committee hearings held in 1991 afforded an opportunity for both the proponents and opponents of this legislation to be heard.

The enthusiasm of the bill's supporters for registering people to vote when applying for a driver's license is shared at the state level. In fact, fully 27 States plus the District of Columbia now provide citizens who want to register to vote while visiting a Department of Motor Vehicles office an opportunity to do so. In 1991, legislation was introduced in the statehouses of an additional 17 States to establish some form of motor voter or agency based systems.¹

While the enthusiasm for such programs at the State level continues to grow, it has not translated into enthusiasm for the strictures of this legislation. This reluctance is partly because States

¹ 100 percent Vote, A Project of Human Serve, Memorandum, May 1, 1991. (50)

are experiencing severe fiscal pressure and simply cannot afford the expensive and unnecessary costs this bill imposes.

State after State has insisted that the costs of motor voter will be substantial and they will have to curtail other programs such as education or child nutrition to come up with the funds needed to meet the unfunded mandates in the bill.

In fact, officials in 13 States with over 36 percent of the Nation's population are so concerned about the financial impact of this proposal they have taken the time to inform the committee of their objections to it. Ten of these States prepared cost estimates of the bill for their jurisdictions.

STATE ESTIMATES OF THE COSTS OF THE PROGRAMS MANDATED BY THE NATIONAL VOTER REGISTRATION ACT
(In millions of dollars)

Alaska.....	0.4
California.....	26.0
Florida (Independent estimate Los Angeles County, CA—4.5)	6.4
Illinois.....	30.4
Kansas: (Independent estimate Douglas County, IL—1.5)	5
New York.....	.045
New Jersey.....	26.3
Oklahoma.....	1.3
South Carolina.....	2.8
Virginia.....	5.0
Total.....	87.55

Alabama, Minnesota, Missouri and South Dakota also expressed concern over the impact of the requirements contained in motor voter.

Furthermore, the following organizations have criticized the National Voter Registration Act for the unfunded mandates it would impose on state and local governments:

- American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators National Association of Counties.
- National Governors Association.
- National Association of Secretaries of State.
- National Association of Towns and Townships.
- National League of Cities.

Imposing these additional costs on state and local governments is particularly hard to justify when one considers that any causal link between the registration programs required by the bill and increased voter turnout is tenuous. The Congressional Research Service studied motor voter programs in states that have adopted them and produced the following findings.

[This proposal] would impose a sweeping requirement to allow mail-in registration while simultaneously limiting significantly the ability of the states to use a variety of techniques to verify the applicant's identity and eligibility. For this reason [the bill's] provision for registration by mail would entail a substantial and perhaps prohibitive risk of enhancing the opportunities for fraudulent registration and voting.³

Section 9(b)(3) of the bill states that a mail registration form "may not include any requirement or other formal authentication." Alaska requires registration applications received through the mail to be authenticated by the signatures of two adults. Other states require notarization of these applications. All of these precautions would be prohibited under the bill.

Mail registration also prohibits a requirement that registration applications be made in-person. By implication, states would be prohibited from asking applicants to supply identification to determine that persons registering are who they claim to be or live where they say they do. Currently, Connecticut requires a birth certificate, driver's license, or Social Security card to be shown at the time of registration. New Hampshire officials have the authority to require similar identification from applicants who are naturalized citizens.

In 1982, a New York Grand Jury reviewed widespread vote fraud charges in Kings County from 1968 to 1982. It observed:

The advent of mail-in registration in 1976 made the creation of bogus registration cards even easier and less subject to detection. . . . According to testimony, mail-in registration has become the principal means of perpetrating election fraud and has apparently resulted in the abandonment of the pre-1976 election fraud methods.⁴

As a District Attorney in New York, Elizabeth Holtzman wrote the New York Times lamenting "how easy it is to vote illegally" there and called for implementation of the recommendations contained in this Grand Jury Report. Under motor voter New York would be prevented from ending what the Grand Jury said had now become "the principal means of perpetrating election fraud."

The Justice Department pointed out that verification of mail registration applications in states that now have it may be inadequate. Many states rely upon the mailing of non-forwardable letters to mail registration applicants when the application is received by the election office. The assumption is that the Postal Service will return notices if an individual does not actually live at the address.

This assumption is false. The Federal Election Commission's Advisory Committee on Election Administration pointed out that such non-forwardable notices are only returned to the sender if the addressee files a change of address with the Postal Service. The Postal Service never inquires whether an addressee actually lives

³ *Ibid.*, p. 6.
⁴ *Summary*, Court of the State of New York, County of Kings: Criminal Term, "In the Matter of Confidential Investigation R64-11," pp. 11-12.

PERCENTAGE OF THE VOTING AGE POPULATION THAT TURNED OUT FOR RESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS

(Before and After the Adoption of Motor Voter Programs, 1972-88)¹

	Turnout of voting age population	Before motor voter	After motor voter
Arizona ²	47.20	46.29
Colorado ²	54.53	56.90
Iowa	63.25	60.00
Michigan ²	59.39	56.76
Minnesota ²	70.62	67.23
Nevada ²	46.45	45.42
North Carolina	43.08	45.34
Ohio	57.23	57.99
Vermont	59.60	63.37
Washington	61.19	58.01

¹ Bruce Coates, "Motor Registration and Turnout in States with Mail and Motor Voter Registration Systems", Congressional Research Service Report, February 23, 1990, The Library of Congress.
² Active motor voter states.

Note that voter turnout dropped after the adoption of motor voter programs in 7 of these 10 states. Collectively, voter turnout declined in states that adopted motor voter programs by 2.68 percent. For the states that practice the active form of motor voter (similar to the requirements of this bill, turnout went down 6.21 percent in Presidential elections. For non-Presidential elections, turnout increased by just over half of one percent.

Given its lackluster effect at the state level, motor voter is a surprising prescription for arresting the decline in voter turnout nationally.

It should also be noted that this bill provides states with a way to escape the expenses and rigors of the bill: adoption of election day registration. The Department of Justice has said that election day registration "... would greatly impair the ability of the Department and the states to combat voting and election fraud. . . [and] would totally preclude meaningful verification of voter eligibility, and thus allow easy corruption of the election process by the unscrupulous."²

Permitting registration on the day of the vote eliminates the ability of election officials to confirm the identity, address and eligibility of a prospective voter. Congress should be reluctant to provide economic incentives to states to adopt a procedure that undermines the very basis of democracy.

For the first time, this bill would subject voter registration systems to the regulatory control of the Federal Elections Commission—an entity many have criticized for being unable to satisfactorily carry out its current federally mandated duties.

MAIL REGISTRATION

The National Voter Registration Act mandates unsupervised registration by mail for all states and forbids precautions states may take to reduce the chance of the unscrupulous taking advantage of the system. The Department of Justice wrote in 1991:

² W. Lee Rawls, Assistant Attorney General, U.S. Department of Justice, Letter to the Honorable Wendell H. Ford, Chairman, U.S. Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, April 17, 1991, p. 10-11.

at an address. If no change of address form has been filed with the Post Office, the mail is delivered no matter who lives at an address.

The Department of Justice pointed out that because of this underlying assumption for verifying the authenticity of a mail registration application is false "... there may in fact be a great deal of fraudulent registration by mail that simply has gone undetected." Nevertheless, this bill mandates this suspect system of registration for all states while forbidding even modest verification procedures for it.

In an effort to reduce the fraud associated with mail registration, the bill has been changed to permit states to require that new voters who have registered by mail must vote in person the first time they vote. States could ask for identification at that time. However, the effectiveness of this requirement is greatly undermined by an exception in the bill that voids the provision if it conflicts with another law. Most states now have absentee balloting. Laying mail registration on top of absentee balloting would result in a complete mailbox voting system particularly susceptible to fraud.

The State of Illinois requires signatures on voter registration applications to be made in front of a registrar. On election day, the signature on the registration form is compared with the signature of the person seeking to vote under that registration form to guard against "ghost voting."

By implication, this bill would prohibit this verification procedure. The Chairman of the Illinois Board of Elections told the Committee that a mail registration program would prevent verification of the original voter application and "would destroy the signature verification process—a key factor in the prevention of vote fraud."⁵

This verification system helped a Grand Jury examining voter fraud in the 1982 Chicago election secure sixty-two indictments resulting in at least fifty-six convictions.⁶ Much of the evidence in this case was based on the work of FBI handwriting experts who compared the signatures on authenticated voter registration cards with signatures made at the polling booths. Such detection would have been impossible if mail registration, as mandated by this bill, were in place.

With mail registration, the perpetrators could have easily escaped detection by simply sending in bogus registration forms, and on polling day, having the same person sign to cast a fraudulent ballot. The signatures would then have been identical.

Even with Chicago's signature verification system, a U.S. attorney has estimated that up to one hundred thousand fraudulent ballots were cast in each of the Chicago elections of 1982 and 1986.⁷ It is difficult to imagine what the extent of the vote fraud problem in that city would be if its signature verification procedures were prohibited by this bill.

⁵ Theresa M. Petrone, Chairman, State Board of Elections, State of Illinois: Testimony to Senate Committee on Rules and Administration; May, 1989, p. 8.
⁶ U.S. District Court, Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division: "Report of the Special January 1982 Grand Jury," pp. 3-6.
⁷ Mark Eisenman, "Massive Fraud Found in Mayoral Primary", Chicago Tribune, March 8, 1986, p. 1, Section 1.

In California, mail registration led to fraudulent filings with a phenomenon called "creative writing." This state experienced fake and duplicate registrations because of registration drives in which registrations were filed, often without knowledge of the "applicant," simply to fill a quota. The problem led this state to hire an investigator to guard against this kind of fraud.

Nationwide mail registration, as proposed by this bill, raises the very real specter of adding to America's illegal immigration problem. Illegal aliens have used easy availability of voter registration cards as a means to gain entry into the United States. Voter registration cards have also been used to gain access to federal and state benefits and even to obtain jobs with the federal government. The Grand Jury sitting in Chicago reported:

Another pool of potential votes for the unscrupulous precinct captain was that of aliens who were illegally registered. Many aliens register to vote so that they can obtain documents identifying them as U.S. citizens; however, the number of aliens who actually voted is undocumented. We have learned that these aliens used their voters' cards to obtain a myriad of benefits, from Social Security to jobs with the Defense Department.⁸

Although this Grand Jury did not document aliens actually voting, a survey⁹ by the Immigration and Naturalization Service of ballots cast in a 1989 U.S. House of Representatives special election in Florida did. In that election, it was confirmed that fully 11 percent of all ballots of foreign born voters sampled were cast by non-citizens. Furthermore, the Immigration and Naturalization Service reported that there is reason to believe that in this federal election, the incidence of illegal alien voting among all ballots examined was as high as 24 percent.

This fraud might be combated by requiring proof of citizenship at the time of registration. However, mail registration under this bill would preclude such corrective action.

This bill would mandate that voter registration cards be accepted by states through the mail from any location in the U.S. (and even around the world for that matter). Therefore, there is the potential for citizens of one state to use mail registration to gain access to another state's benefits.

Alaska, in addition to witnessed signatures, requires all out-of-state mail registration applicants to provide "identification or other documentation that supports... a claim to Alaska residency."¹⁰ This precaution would be prohibited under this legislation.

The bill would require all mail registration applications to be processed if postmarked up to thirty days before an election. The Alaska Division of Elections has reviewed absentee mail ballots and found that almost thirty percent of them had illegible postmarks. This would be a problem around the nation and could unintentionally disenfranchise many voters.

⁸ "Report of the Special January 1982 Grand Jury," op. cit., p. 8-9.
⁹ Richard Wallace, "INS: Noncitizens Voted in 1989 Election, State Doesn't Require Proof of Citizenship to Register to Vote", Miami Herald, March 9, 1991, p. 1B, Section Local.
¹⁰ 6 Alaska Administrative Code 25.027 (c).

Election fraud disenfranchises voters. It erodes confidence in our democratic traditions. Unfortunately, it is not a problem confined to the past and, in some areas of the nation, it will continue to be a problem in the future. The mail registration provisions of this bill would strip the states of their ability to deal with these election fraud problems.

AGENCY BASED REGISTRATION

This bill would require all public assistance, unemployment, and vocational rehabilitation offices to register those who receive benefits from those offices.

In its letter to the Committee, the Department of Justice wrote in 1991:

The Department's experience demonstrates that public officials sometimes use their power to dispense or withhold benefits in order to pressure citizens into voting a particular way or registering for a particular party. This bill would increase substantially the opportunities for such intimidation and coercion of the public.¹¹

The Justice Department was not engaging in mere speculation. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch reported on an investigation into allegations that public assistance employees were routinely registering public assistance applicants, "suggesting" who they should vote for and taking them to the polls.¹²

Such exploitation of vulnerable public assistance recipients is not a new phenomena and continues today. This bill would require public assistance employees across the nation to become actively involved in the administration of elections and we think the results will mean more political manipulation and abuse of public recipients.

The threat of public employee misconduct is not the sole objection to the agency registration provisions of this bill. Even the appearance that a person's public assistance benefits are linked to registering to vote violates the American tradition of voluntary participation in the political system. It should not be required by the federal government.

CONCLUSION

Although greater voter participation is a goal shared by all Members of the Committee, state experience with motor voter programs demonstrate that such programs do not increase voter turnout. What will increase are the costs to state and local governments and opportunities for election fraud.

The lion's share of any new registration under this bill is expected to be done at Departments of Motor Vehicles. The supporters of the bill assume that both mail registration and agency-based registration under this bill will account for only a small portion of the new registrations. The bill as written, therefore, risks significant

¹¹ Rawls, op. cit., 7-8.

¹² St. Louis Post-Dispatch, "State Investigating Centreville Township", August 29, 1990, p. 5a.

new opportunities for vote fraud and improprieties by governmental agencies for no significant increase in voter participation.

Rather than assisting state efforts to implement innovative voter registration program, this legislation will impose obligations that are impractical, ineffective and an expensive burden for states.

TED STEVENS.

JESSE HELMS.

JOHN WARNER.

BOB DOLE.

MITCH MCCONNELL.

THAD COCHRAN.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with paragraph 12 of rule XXVI of the Standing rules of the senate, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in [bold brackets], new matter is printed in *italic*, and existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

TITLE 39, UNITED STATES CODE

POSTAL SERVICE

PART I—GENERAL

CHAPTER 1—POSTAL POLICY AND DEFINITIONS

CHAPTER 24—APPROPRIATIONS AND ANNUAL REPORT

Sec.
2401. Appropriations.
2402. Annual report.

§ 2401. Appropriations

(a) There are appropriated to the Postal Service all revenues received by the Postal Service.

(c) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Postal Service each year a sum determined by the Postal Service to be equal to the difference between the revenues the Postal Service would have received if sections 3217, 3403-3406, [and 3626(a)-(h) and (j)-(k) of this title.] *3626(a)-(i), 3626(j)-(k), and 3629 of this title* had not been enacted and the estimated revenues to be received on mail carried under such sections and Acts. In requesting an appropriation under this subsection for a fiscal year, the Postal Service shall (i) include an amount to reconcile sums authorized to be appropriated for prior fiscal years on the basis of estimated mail volume with sums which would have been authorized to be appropriated if based on the final audited mail volume; and (ii) calculate the sums requested in respect of mail under former sections 4452(b) and 4452(c) of this title as though all such mail consisted of letter shaped pieces, as such pieces are defined in the then effective classification and rate schedules.

(59)

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF SENATOR HATFIELD

The bill we report today is substantially similar to S. 250 of the 102nd Congress, the National Voter Registration Act. I supported this legislation last year after the Committee Chairman and I worked to improve its provisions related to protection of the electoral process from registration fraud.

During consideration of the bill last year, the Chairman and I worked to mandate an address verification system which makes a "reasonable" attempt to clean the voting rolls, as well as provisions to allow states to require mail registrants to vote in person the first time.

The goal embodied in this legislation, to improve accessibility to the voting process, deserves our careful consideration at the federal level. The National Voter Registration Act sets a national standard through a national system to provide equal access to the process for all Americans.

My own state's experience with "motor-voter" legislation attests to the merits of a national standard. Oregon enacted its own law in 1991 and from all accounts, its effects on voting habits are quite positive. The number of registered voters in Oregon jumped by 15 percent between the 1990 and 1992 general election. Of all the transactions that have occurred at offices of the Oregon Motor Vehicles Division (DMV) across the state since the "motor-voter" law took effect in October of 1991, 24 percent involved some sort of voter registration activity.

I have remaining concerns about the cost which may be borne by the states in implementing this legislation. The bill now includes a postal rate reduction for state registrars which will be a helpful tool for offsetting the cost to the states of mail registration. My state reports that from the onset of Oregon's law in late 1991 to January 1 of this year, the DMV has spent \$86,135 on voter registration activities. The Division's 1991-1993 biennial budget for "motor-voter" services is \$122,598. These are not exorbitant expenditures, because my state has actively sought methods to cut costs. For example, county clerks in several Oregon counties save postage by going to the local DMV offices in person to pick up the new registration cards. Clearly, the postal rate reduction will be a supportive addition, but it does not compensate for the total additional costs of "motor-voter" procedures. This tradeoff suggests the value we in the federal government place on opening access to the electoral process.

I support the National Voter Registration Act and encourage its swift passage by the Senate.

MARK O. HATFIELD.

(58)

CHAPTER 36—POSTAL RATES, CLASSES, AND SERVICES

SUBCHAPTER I—POSTAL RATE COMMISSION

- Sec. 3601. Establishment.
- 3602. Terms of office.
- 3603. Rules; regulations; procedures.
- 3604. Administration.

SUBCHAPTER II—PERMANENT RATES AND CLASSES OF MAIL

- 3621. Authority to fix rates and classes.
- 3622. Rates and fees.
- 3623. Mail classification.
- 3624. Recommended decisions of Commission.
- 3625. Action of the Governors.
- 3636. Reduced rates.
- 3627. Adjusting free and reduced rates.
- 3628. Appellate review.
- 3629. Reduced rates for voter registration purposes.

§ 3627. Adjusting free and reduced rates

If Congress fails to appropriate an amount authorized under section 2401(c) of this title for any class of mail sent at a free or reduced rate under section 3217, 3403-3406, [or 3626 of this title,] 3626, or 3629 of this title, the rate for that class may be adjusted in accordance with the provisions of this subchapter so that the increased revenues received from the users of such class will equal the amount for that class that the Congress was to appropriate.

§ 3629. Reduced rates for voter registration purposes

The Postal Service shall make available to a State or local voting registration official the rate for any class of mail that is available to a qualified nonprofit organization under section 3626 for the purpose of making a mailing that the official certifies is required or authorized by the National Voter Registration Act of 1993.

()

()

()

The following table shows the results of the survey conducted in the year 1997-1998. The data is presented in a tabular format, showing the number of respondents for each category. The categories are listed in the first column, and the corresponding number of respondents is listed in the second column. The total number of respondents is 100.

Category	Number of Respondents
Category 1	25
Category 2	30
Category 3	15
Category 4	10
Category 5	10
Category 6	5
Category 7	5
Category 8	5
Category 9	5
Category 10	5
Category 11	5
Category 12	5
Category 13	5
Category 14	5
Category 15	5
Category 16	5
Category 17	5
Category 18	5
Category 19	5
Category 20	5
Category 21	5
Category 22	5
Category 23	5
Category 24	5
Category 25	5
Category 26	5
Category 27	5
Category 28	5
Category 29	5
Category 30	5
Category 31	5
Category 32	5
Category 33	5
Category 34	5
Category 35	5
Category 36	5
Category 37	5
Category 38	5
Category 39	5
Category 40	5
Category 41	5
Category 42	5
Category 43	5
Category 44	5
Category 45	5
Category 46	5
Category 47	5
Category 48	5
Category 49	5
Category 50	5
Category 51	5
Category 52	5
Category 53	5
Category 54	5
Category 55	5
Category 56	5
Category 57	5
Category 58	5
Category 59	5
Category 60	5
Category 61	5
Category 62	5
Category 63	5
Category 64	5
Category 65	5
Category 66	5
Category 67	5
Category 68	5
Category 69	5
Category 70	5
Category 71	5
Category 72	5
Category 73	5
Category 74	5
Category 75	5
Category 76	5
Category 77	5
Category 78	5
Category 79	5
Category 80	5
Category 81	5
Category 82	5
Category 83	5
Category 84	5
Category 85	5
Category 86	5
Category 87	5
Category 88	5
Category 89	5
Category 90	5
Category 91	5
Category 92	5
Category 93	5
Category 94	5
Category 95	5
Category 96	5
Category 97	5
Category 98	5
Category 99	5
Category 100	5

APPENDIX D - THE JOINT CONFERENCE COMMITTEE REPORT ON THE ACT

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2), to establish national voter registration procedures for Federal elections submit the following joint statement to the House and to the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment struck out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute text, and the House disagreed to the Senate amendment.

The Committee of Conference recommends that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the text of the House bill and the Senate amendment to the text of the House bill.

The differences between the text of the House bill, the Senate amendment thereto, and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted below, except for clerical corrections, conforming changes made necessary by reason of agreements reached by the conferees, and minor drafting and clarifying changes.

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE

The House bill (H. R. 2), the Senate amendment, and the conference agreement provide that this legislation may be cited as the "National Voter Registration Act of 1993".

SECTION 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES

The House bill, the Senate amendment, and the conference agreement set forth identical findings of the Congress and purposes of the Act.

SECTION 3. DEFINITIONS

The House bill, the Senate amendment, and the conference agreement set forth identical definitions for the terms "election", "Federal office", "motor vehicle driver's license", "State", and "voter registration agency".

SECTION 4. NATIONAL PROCEDURES FOR VOTER REGISTRATION FOR ELECTIONS FOR FEDERAL OFFICE

House bill

Section 4 requires that each State establish procedures to register to vote in elections for Federal office by application made simultaneously with an application for a motor vehicle driver's license (motor voter), by mail application, and by application at a

designated Federal, State or nongovernmental office (agency based registration). The bill would exempt any State that has no registration requirement to vote in a Federal election or any State that permits registration at the polling place at the time of voting in a Federal election.

Senate amendment

The amendment includes the same requirements for registration as the House bill, but limits the exemption to States that had enacted such a provision on or prior to March 11, 1993 and in effect continuously on and after that date. It also extends that exemption to any State that had enacted such legislation on or prior to that date, but provided that it would go into effect only upon enactment of this Act. To qualify, a State must provide such registration procedures for Federal elections in the year of the Presidential election.

Conference substitute

The Conferees agreed to the Senate amendment with the modification that such State provision must apply to Federal elections generally, not just to those in Presidential election years. This modification retains the provisions and requirements of the Senate amendment regarding the effective date and enactment date of such State laws, and the provision of the House bill that such State laws must apply to all Federal elections, not just those occurring in the same year of a Presidential election. There was concern that the State amendment might be interpreted to exempt a State that permitted election day registration, or that had no registration requirement, for voting for Presidential electors only, which is not the intent of the conferees.

SECTION 5. SIMULTANEOUS APPLICATION FOR VOTER REGISTRATION
AND APPLICATION FOR MOTOR VEHICLE DRIVER'S LICENSE

House bill

Section 5 provides that an application for State driver's license or the renewal of a driver's license shall serve as an application for voter registration. It provides that an applicant for a license may decline in writing to be registered by means of that application. It further requires that the application form include a means by which the applicant may decline to register.

It requires that the voter registration application shall be part of the driver's license application; shall not require information which duplicates the license portion of the form except such information as shall be required to prevent duplicate registration and to make an assessment of eligibility; shall include a statement that specifies each eligibility requirement, contains an attestation clause that applicant meets each requirement and requires signature of applicant under penalty of perjury; and shall be transmitted to the appropriate state election officials. There is no provision pertaining to a transmittal deadline.

Senate amendment

The Senate amendment is similar to the House bill with the following modifications:

1. The Senate amendment does not include the provisions of the House bill pertaining to declination. Rather, it provides that the failure of the applicant to sign the voter registration portion of the application serves as a declination to apply to register.

2. The voter registration application form must, in addition to the requirements set forth in the bill, include in print that is identical to the attestation statement, a statement of the voter eligibility requirements, penalties for submitting a false application, and that the fact of declining to register and place of registration are confidential and will be used only for registration purposes. A similar change was made for the mail registration application.

3. The Senate amendment contains a transmittal provision identical to that contained in the agency section of the House bill. The voter registration portion of a driver's license application must be transmitted to the appropriate State election official no later than 10 days after it has been accepted, or not later than 5 days after the date of acceptance, if the application has been accepted within 5 days of the deadline for registering.

Conference substitute

Same as Senate amendment. Under the House bill, the failure of the applicant to sign the voter registration portion of the application is not addressed, and the conferees agree that the Senate amendment clarifies the outcome of a failure to sign, so that the applicant would be considered to have declined.

SECTION 6. MAIL REGISTRATION

House bill

Provides that each State shall accept and use a mail voter registration application form promulgated by the FEC. In addition, a State may develop and use its own form which meets the criteria of the FEC form. Notarization or other formal authentication is not allowed. Forms shall be readily available for public and private distribution, and especially for organized registration programs.

A State may, by law, require a personal appearance to vote if the person was registered to vote in a local jurisdiction by mail and the person has not previously voted in that jurisdiction. Individuals who are entitled to vote by absentee ballot under the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act and those provided the right to vote other than in person by the Voting Accessibility for the Elderly and Handicapped Act, or any other Federal law, are exempt. There is no provision pertaining to undelivered notices.

Senate amendment

The Senate amendment is similar to the House bill but with an additional provision pertaining to undelivered notices. It provides that for applications made by mail, if a State sends a notice of the disposition of the application by non-forwardable mail and, if the notice is returned undelivered, the registrar may remove the

name of the applicant in accordance with the procedures contained in the purge section of the Act.

Conference substitute

The substitute is the same as the Senate amendment, with a modification in the language to make clear that this provision applies only to notices sent pursuant to Section 8(a)(2) in response to applications by mail. In addition, the technical modification clarifies that a State may not simply remove the name of the applicant from its list, but, rather must follow the regular process set forth in section 8(d).

SECTION 7. VOTER REGISTRATION AGENCIES

House bill

State, Federal and private sector locations shall be designated for the distribution and processing of voter registration applications. States shall designate all offices providing public assistance, unemployment compensation, and related services, and all offices which provide State-funded programs primarily engaged in providing services to persons with disabilities as registration agencies. Such designated offices, shall provide the same assistance in completion of registration application as is provided with regard to that agency's forms. States shall designate other agencies, which may include libraries, schools, fishing/hunting license bureaus, marriage license offices, and any offices that provide services to persons with disabilities to provide forms, assistance and processing of voter registration applications. The Federal Government shall cooperate in this program.

An applicant for services may decline in writing to be registered to vote and no information relating to a declination may be used for any other purpose. If a voter registration office designated by a State provides services to a person with disabilities at the person's home, the office shall provide the voting registration services at the person's home.

Senate amendment

The Senate amendment is similar to the House bill, but includes three significant changes. The agency program at offices that provide public assistance, unemployment compensation and related services is made discretionary with the States. The Senate amendment also provides that assistance is to be provided to an applicant unless the applicant refuses assistance.

The Senate amendment mandates that recruitment offices of the Armed Forces be designated voter registration agencies for the purposes of the Act. The provision requires the Secretary of Defense to work with each State to develop and implement procedures for persons to apply to register at recruitment offices.

Conference substitute

This provision is similar to the Senate amendment, but it makes two changes. First, agency-based registration at public assistance agencies and at agencies providing services to disabled persons is made mandatory as it was in the House bill. Unemploy-

ment compensation offices are included in the discretionary program as in the Senate amendment. The provision of the Senate amendment regarding assistance to applicants by such agencies is retained.

The conference is concerned that the Senate amendment would permit States to restrict their agency program and defeat a principal purpose of this Act—to increase the number of eligible citizens who register to vote. If a State does not include either public assistance, agencies serving persons with disabilities, or unemployment compensation offices in its agency program, it will exclude a segment of its population from those for whom registration will be convenient and readily available—the poor and persons with disabilities who do not have driver's licenses and will not come into contact with the other principle place to register under this Act. It is important that no State be permitted to so restrict its agency registration program. To eliminate the mandatory agency program altogether will not accomplish the objectives of this Act, since the States are already free to establish agency registration. The only way to assure that no State can create an agency registration program that discriminates against a distinct portion of its population is to require that the agencies designated in each State include an agency that has regular contact with those who do not have driver's licenses.

Of those agencies included in the mandatory program in the House bill, it appears to the conferees that those agencies most likely to have such contact and complement the motor vehicle agency registration program are those agencies that provide public assistance and services to persons with disabilities. By public assistance agencies, we intend to include those State agencies in each State that administer or provide services under the food stamp, medicaid, the Women, Infants and Children (WIC), and the Aid to Families With Dependent Children (AFDC) programs. If the States are required to include these programs, as well as those that provide assistance to persons with disabilities, we will be assured that almost all of our citizens will come into contact with an office at which they may apply to register to vote with the same convenience as will be available to most other people under the motor voter program of this Act.

The second change is intended to deal with concerns raised about the inclusion of certain agencies in an agency-based registration program and the possibility of intimidation or coercion. Concern was expressed that in agencies that provide benefits, staff might suggest that registering to vote could have some bearing on the availability of services or benefits provided by that agency. In addition to the provisions in the House bill relating to coercion and intimidation, the conference substitute includes specific provisions to address that situation.

One provision (Section 7(a)(5)(D)) would prohibit a person providing services at an agency from making any statement to an applicant or taking any action that could lead the applicant to believe that his or her decisions regarding registering to vote had any bearing on the availability of services or benefits.

Another provision (Section 7(a)(6)(B)) would require an agency to include on a form the question "If you are not registered to vote

where you live now, would you like to apply to register to vote here today?" In response to that question, the form would include a box for the applicant to accept or decline to apply to register to vote. Failure to check either would be deemed a declination for purposes of this provision. In addition to that question, these forms would include a statement to the effect that if the applicant would like assistance in completing the application, the agency staff is available to provide that assistance; and that such a decision is left to the individual with a further statement that the applicant may complete the voter registration application in private. Such form would also include the statement: "Applying to register or declining to register to vote will not affect the amount of assistance you are provided by this agency."

The form would also include a statement advising the applicant that he or she may file a complaint with the appropriate State official should that applicant believe that someone has interfered with his or her right to register, or to privacy, or to choose his or her own political party or preference. The appropriate official's name, address and telephone number would be included with that statement.

To insure effective voter registration programs without coercion and intimidation the conferees have looked to ongoing agency-based registration programs. Some States, such as Pennsylvania and Minnesota, which have already developed an agency-based registration program in agencies that provide benefits have incorporated into their agency forms similar statements and questions to applicants informing them of their rights.

The conferees believe that based on the experience of these States, the inclusion of such questions and statements on the agency forms in an agency-based program would serve to deter coercion and intimidation in such a program.

SECTION 8. REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO ADMINISTRATION OF VOTER REGISTRATION

House bill

This section includes a number of administrative requirements. It provides that the registration cutoff may be no more than 30 days before election or such lesser period as State may provide. It requires that the State election officials notify each applicant of the disposition of his or her registration application. The bill provides that a voter's name may be removed from voter rolls only: (1) at the request of the voter; or (2) as provided by State law, by reason of criminal conviction or mental incapacity. The States shall conduct a general program that makes a reasonable effort to remove the names of ineligible voters by reason of (1) death; or (2) by reason of a change of residence of the voter. A voter's name may not be removed for non-voting. Any State program or activity designed to ensure the maintenance of an accurate and current voter registration roll shall be uniform, nondiscriminatory, and in compliance with the Voting Rights Act of 1965. It does not permit a State to conduct a systematic procedure to confirm voting lists within 90 days before a Federal election. A State may use the National Change of Address (NCOA) program and may make the change of

address on the registration rolls with a notification to the voter of such change.

No State may remove the name of a voter from the rolls due to possible change of address unless the registrant confirms in writing to have moved out of voting jurisdiction, or the voter fails to respond to a notice and does not appear to vote and correct the record during period between date of notice and second general election for Federal office. Where the change of address is to an address covered by the same polling place, the voter shall be permitted to vote upon oral or written affirmation of the change of address. If a registrant has moved to a residence in a new polling place within the jurisdiction of the same voting registrar and the same congressional district, the registrant shall be permitted to vote in one of the following manners, at the option of the registrant: (1) with oral or written affirmation of the new address at the old polling place or, (2) upon written affirmation of the change of address at a designated central location where a list of eligible voters is maintained. Such a registrant may also appear at the appropriate polling place for the new address for the purposes of correcting the registration record, and shall vote, if permitted by State law. If State law permits voting at the new polling place, by oral or written affirmation of the current address, voting at the other locations need not be provided as options. If registration records indicate that a registrant has moved, and in fact has not, the registrant may vote upon oral or written affirmation that he or she continues to reside at the same address.

The bill also provides that State and local voting registration officials would be able to receive reduced postal rates for the purpose of making any mailing which is required or authorized by the Act. This reduced rate would be funded through a revenue foregone appropriation.

Each State is required to maintain and make available for public inspection and copying upon payment of reasonable costs, all records concerning the implementation of programs and activities designed to ensure the accuracy of the voting rolls. These records shall include lists of the names and addresses of those individuals sent notices and information regarding whether or not these individuals have responded. The identity of the voter registration agency through which any particular voter is registered shall not be disclosed to the public.

Senate amendment

The amendment is the same as the bill with the exception of the location at which a voter may vote upon written or oral affirmation after moving from one location to another within the same registrar's jurisdiction and same Congressional district. That provision is modified to provide that if State law permits voting at either the old polling place, a central location, or the new polling place, by oral or written affirmation of the current address, voting at the other locations need not be provided as options.

Conference substitute

This section is the same as the Senate amendment with a further modification of the provision regarding the polling place at

which a person may vote who has moved to another address within the jurisdiction of the same registrar and the same Congressional district. It provides that if State law permits voting, under such circumstances, at either the old polling place or the new polling place, by oral or written affirmation, voting at the other locations (old polling place or central location) need not be provided as options to the registrant.

There was concern that permitting a State to require a person to go to a central location to change his or her address and vote could result in hardship to voters in areas where travel to a central location might be difficult due to distance or the lack of convenient means of transportation. Such problems could discourage, or even effectively prevent, some persons from voting. The effect of the amendment is to give each State the option of designating either the polling place for the old address or for the new address. If a State does not provide for voting under those circumstances at either of those locations, the Act would require that the registrant have the option of voting at the polling place for his or her old address or at a central location.

SECTION 9. FEDERAL COORDINATION AND REGULATION

House bill

The House bill provides the Federal Election Commission the general authority to promulgate appropriate regulations necessary to carry out the Act. In addition, the Commission is to consult with chief election officers of the States to develop a mail voter registration application form for Federal elections and to submit to Congress, by June 30 of each odd-numbered year, a report assessing the impact of the Act on the administration of elections for Federal office and recommendations for improvements in procedures, forms or other matters.

Senate amendment

The Senate amendment is identical to the House bill, except that it limits the Commission's regulatory authority to prescribing only those regulations necessary to carry out its specific responsibilities in designing the mail registration application form and in reporting to the Congress.

Conference substitute

Adopts the Senate amendment. Although the Senate amendment narrows the provision contained in the House bill, the conferees expect the Commission to play an advisory role to the States and to facilitate the exchange of information among the States.

SECTION 10. DESIGNATION OF CHIEF STATE ELECTION OFFICIAL

The House bill, Senate amendment and Conference substitute are identical and require that each State designate an official to coordinate State responsibilities under the Act.

SECTION 11. CIVIL ENFORCEMENT AND PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION

House bill

The bill provides that civil enforcement through injunction or declaratory relief may be brought by the U.S. Attorney General, or a person with notice to the chief election official of the State. The rights and remedies established by the Act are in addition to any other rights and remedies provided by law and no provision shall supersede, restrict, or limit the application of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Nothing in this Act authorizes or requires conduct that is prohibited by the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Senate amendment

Same as House bill.

Conference substitute

Same as House bill.

SECTION 12. CRIMINAL PENALTIES

House bill

Federal criminal penalties will apply for registration offenses which are knowing and willful and fines are to be disposed of in accordance with Title 18 of the United States Code.

Senate amendment

The amendment is identical to the House bill except for the disposition of fines, which are paid into the general fund of the Treasury. This modification was necessary to avoid a Budget Act point of order.

Conference substitute

Same as Senate amendment.

SECTION 13. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION

House bill

No provision.

Senate amendment

Provides that nothing in this Act shall prevent a State from requiring presentation of documentation relating to citizenship of an applicant for voter registration.

Conference substitute

The conferees agree with the House bill and do not include this provision from the Senate amendment. It is not necessary or consistent with the purposes of this Act. Furthermore, there is concern that it could be interpreted by States to permit registration requirements that could effectively eliminate, or seriously interfere with, the mail registration program of the Act. It could also adversely affect the administration of the other registration programs as well. In addition, it creates confusion with regard to the relationship of this Act to the Voting Rights Act. Except for this provision, this Act has been carefully drafted to assure that it would not

supersede, restrict or limit the application of the Voting Rights Act. These concerns lead the conferees to conclude that this section should be deleted.

SECTION 14. EFFECTIVE DATE

House bill

The bill provides that the Act will take effect January 1, 1995 in all States except those with constitutional provisions that would require a separate State and Federal voter roll. In order to give those States sufficient time to amend their constitutions to permit compliance without dual voter rolls, an effective date of January 1, 1996 is set.

Senate amendment

The amendment includes the same provisions as the bill and adds a further extension for any State that cannot amend its constitution before the 1996 effective date without a special election. For any such State, the effective date would be the date that is 120 days after the date by which it would be legally possible to amend the State constitution without a special election.

Conference substitute

Same as Senate amendment.

CHARLIE ROSE,
AL SWIFT,
MARTIN FROST,
STENY H. HOYER,
GERALD D. KLECZKA,
JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,

Managers on the Part of the House.

WENDELL FORD,
CLAIBORNE PELL,
DANIEL K. INOUE,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

○

APPENDIX E FEDERAL DIRECTORY

ELECTION COMMITTEES IN CONGRESS

SENATE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

305 Senate Russell Office Building
Washington, DC 20510-6325

Contact:

John L. Sousa
Chief Counsel
(202) 224-5648

or

Thomas E. Zoeller,
Counsel
(202) 224-0279

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

H-326 Capitol
Washington, DC 20515-6157

Contact:

Eric F. Kleinfeld
General Counsel
(202) 225-2061

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS

802 O'Neill House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-6162

Contact:

Herbert S. Stone
Staff Director
(202) 226-7616

DIRECTORY OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

999 E Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20463

Contact:

Susan Propper
Assistant General Counsel,
Regulations
(202) 219-3690

or

Penelope Bonsall,
Director, National Clearinghouse
on Election Administration
(202) 219-3670

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Civil Rights Division

P.O. Box 66128
Washington, DC 20035

Contact:

Barry Weinberg
Deputy Chief, Voting Section
(202) 307-3266

Election Crimes Branch

Bond Building, 12th Fl.
1400 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005

Contact:

Craig C. Donsanto
Director
(202) 514-1421

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Federal Voting Assistance Program

Pentagon Rm. 1B-457
Washington, DC 20301

Contact:

Phyllis Taylor
Director
(703) 693-6500

**DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
AND HUMAN SERVICES***Office of Family Assistance*

370 L'Enfant Promenade, S.W.

Washington, DC 20447

Contact:

Larry Carnes

Aid to Families with Dependent Children

(AFDC) Program

(202) 401-5782

*Health Care Financing Administration**(Medicaid)*

200 Independence Avenue, S.W.

Washington, DC 20201

Contact:

Carla Bodagli

(202) 690-5636

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE*Food and Nutrition Service*

Alexandria, VA 22302

Contact:

Clara L. French

Special Supplemental Food Program

for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC)

(703) 305-2730

or

Dwight Moritz

Food Stamp Program

(703) 305-2520

U.S. POSTAL SERVICE*Customer Service Support Department**Business Mail Acceptance*

475 L'Enfant Plaza, S.W.

Room 8530

Washington, DC 20260-6808

Contact:

Anita Bizzoto

Manager

(202) 268-5174

National Address Information Center

(NCOA)

6060 Primacy Parkway, Ste. 101

Memphis, TN 38188-0001

Contact:

Bernard M. Spiegel

Project Manager

(901) 331-5746

NCOA VENDORS - MARKETING CONTACTS

<p>* ATTENTION: MIKE FORD ACXIOM CORP 301 INDUSTRIAL BLVD CONWAY AR 72032-7168 (501) 336-1442</p>	<p>ATTENTION: KATHY HASSELKUS GLOBE LIFE AND ACCIDENT INS CO GLOBE LIFE CENTER OKLAHOMA CITY OK 73184-0001 (405) 749-7413</p>	<p>ATTENTION: BETH RAIOLA NEODATA SERVICES 6707 WINCHESTER CIR BOULDER CO 80301-3513 (303) 530-0606</p>
<p>* ATTENTION: PAUL STORCH ANCHOR COMPUTER 1900 NEW HWY FARMINGDALE NY 11735-1537 (516) 293-6100</p>	<p>* ATTENTION: HENRY PONDER GRIZZARD ADVERTISING INC 1002 TEXAS PKY STAFFORD TX 77477-6482 (713) 499-0417</p>	<p>* ATTENTION: MELVIN FOX PSA 8800 EDGEWORTH DR CAPITOL HEIGHTS MD 20743-3711 (301) 350-5600</p>
<p>* ATTENTION: GEOFF WATERS CREATIVE AUTOMATION CO 3050 S CALHOUN RD. NEW BERLIN WI 53151-3549 (708) 449-2800</p>	<p>* ATTENTION: CRAIG COMBEST HARTE HANKS DATA TECHNOLOGIES 1329 ARLINGTON ST CINCINNATI OH 45225-1380 (513) 853-7701</p>	<p>* ATTENTION: LEO YOCHIM PRINTRONIC CORP OF AMERICA 17 BATTERY PL 15TH FL NEW YORK NY 10004-1298 (212) 480-4000</p>
<p>* ATTENTION: JOE BALABAN DATABASE AMERICA INFO SYS INC 100 PARAGON DR MONTVALE NJ 07645-1745 (201) 476-2000</p>	<p>* ATTENTION: MARTY GAMBLE LCS INDUSTRIES INC 120 BRIGHTON RD CLIFTON NJ 07012-1694 (201) 614-3421</p>	<p>* ATTENTION: LYNNE CURRIN R L POLK AND COMPANY 6400 MONROE BLVD TAYLOR MI 48180-1884 (313) 292-3200 ext 5210</p>
<p>ATTENTION: DANIEL J MINNICK DIRECT MARKETING TECH INC 955 AMERICAN LN SCHAUMBURG IL 60173-4998 (708) 517-5683</p>	<p>* ATTENTION: LINDA MCCLOSKEY LIST MAINTENANCE CORP 111 BUSINESS PARK DR ARMONK NY 10504-1737 (914) 273-6380</p>	<p>* ATTENTION: ROBERT J O'BRIEN TIME CUSTOMER SERVICE INC I N DALE MABRY TAMPA FL 33609-2700 (813) 878-6903</p>
<p>* ATTENTION: WILLIAM WEISSHAAR DONNELLEY MARKETING 1235 N AVE NEVADA IA 50201-5000 (515) 382-8202</p>	<p>* ATTENTION: GEORGE CAVALENES MAY AND SPEH 1501 OPUS PL DOWNERS GROVE IL 60515-5727 (708) 964-1501</p>	<p>* ATTENTION: MAYLENE SCARLETTE TRIPLEX DIRECT MARKETING CORP 20 LEVERONI CT NOVATO CA 94949-5756 (415) 382-7109</p>
<p>ATTENTION: MARTY MCHALE EQUIFAX INFORMATION TECH INC 11011 RICHMOND AVE STE 100 HOUSTON TX 77042-4773 (713) 954-6400</p>	<p>ATTENTION: STAN BRAUNSTEIN MBS/MULTIMODE INC 7 NORDEN LN HUNTINGTON STA NY 11746-2139 (516) 673-5600</p>	<p>* ATTENTION: MARK TINUCCI TRW TARGET MARKETING SERVICES 901 N INTERNATIONAL PKY STE 191 RICHARDSON TX 75081-2885 (214) 699-1271</p>
<p>* ATTENTION: MIKE TALBOTT **FDC INC 600 HWY 169 S STE 500 MINNEAPOLIS MN 55426-1209 (612) 541-6500</p>	<p>* ATTENTION: BETSY CONLIN METROMAIL CORPORATION 360 E 22ND ST LOMBARD IL 60148-4989 (708) 620-3300</p>	<p>* ATTENTION: JOHN SAWICKI WATS MARKETING OF AMERICA INC 2301 N 117TH AVE OMAHA NE 68164-3682 (402) 498-7662</p>

* - LICENSEE PROVIDES NIXIE ELIMINATION. ** - LICENSEE PROVIDES DISKETTE PROCESSING.

[The page contains extremely faint and illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the paper. The text is arranged in several paragraphs and is completely unreadable.]

(

(

(