''too big to fail'', to protect the American taxpayer by ending bailouts, to protect consumers from abusive financial services practices, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3765

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3765 intended to be proposed to S. 3217, an original bill to promote the financial stability of the United States by improving accountability and transparency in the financial system, to end ''too big to fail'', to protect the American taxpayer by ending bailouts, to protect consumers from abusive financial services practices, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3769

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3769 intended to be proposed to S. 3217, an original bill to promote the financial stability of the United States by improving accountability and transparency in the financial system, to end ''too big to fail'', to protect the American taxpayer by ending bailouts, to protect consumers from abusive financial services practices, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3770

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3770 intended to be proposed to S. 3217, an original bill to promote the financial stability of the United States by improving accountability and transparency in the financial system, to end ''too big to fail'', to protect the American taxpayer by ending bailouts, to protect consumers from abusive financial services practices, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3772

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3772 intended to be proposed to S. 3217, an original bill to promote the financial stability of the United States by improving accountability and transparency in the financial system, to end ''too big to fail'', to protect the American taxpayer by ending bailouts, to protect consumers from abusive financial services practices, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3775

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3775 intended to be proposed to S. 3217, an original bill to promote the financial stability of the United States by improving accountability and transparency in the financial system, to end ''too big to fail'', to protect the American taxpayer by ending bailouts, to protect consumers from abusive financial services practices, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3778

At the request of Mr. UDALL of Colorado, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3778 intended to be proposed to S. 3217, an original bill to promote the financial stability of the United States by improving accountability and transparency in the financial system, to end ''too big to fail'', to protect the American taxpayer by ending bailouts, to protect consumers from abusive financial services practices, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3780

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3780 intended to be proposed to S. 3217, an original bill to promote the financial stability of the United States by improving accountability and transparency in the financial system, to end ''too big to fail'', to protect the American taxpayer by ending bailouts, to protect consumers from abusive financial services practices, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3781

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3781 intended to be proposed to S. 3217, an original bill to promote the financial stability of the United States by improving accountability and transparency in the financial system, to end ''too big to fail'', to protect the American taxpayer by ending bailouts, to protect consumers from abusive financial services practices, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3784

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3784 intended to be proposed to S. 3217, an original bill to promote the financial stability of the United States by improving accountability and transparency in the financial system, to end ''too big to fail'', to protect the American taxpayer by ending bailouts, to protect consumers from abusive financial services practices, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. KERRY):

S. 3297. A bill to update United States policy and authorities to help advance a genuine transition to democracy and to promote recovery in Zimbabwe; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, today I am pleased to introduce the Zimbabwe Transition to Democracy and Economic Recovery Act with Senator ISAKSON and Senator KERRY. This legislation aims to update U.S. policy and to provide the necessary direction and flexibility for the United States to proactively push for democracy and economic recovery in Zimbabwe. In September 2008, the parties in Zimbabwe signed the Global Political Agreement, the GPA, and committed to work together to chart a new political direction for the country. Unfortunately, that commitment has not yet been fulfilled and political and human rights abuses continue at a disturbing rate. Nonetheless, the GPA and the formation of the transitional government have created new political realities and realignment in Zimbabwe, and subsequently, new opportunities to push for a genuine transition to democracy and for economic recovery. The United States and other international stakeholders can seize those opportunities by supporting reformers, while renewing and ramping up pressure on those who obstruct implementation of the GPA. Our bill aims to promote such a dynamic approach.

We are all familiar with the tragic story of Zimbabwe's descent. Zimbabwe was one of Africa's most prosperous countries, a major food producer and home to the continent's best education system. Its leader Robert Mugabe was considered one of the great liberation leaders of southern Africa. Yet over time, Mugabe and his regime moved to tighten their grip on power, using increasingly violent tactics to stop the political opposition, stifle independent media, and take over private property. The results, particularly in the last decade, have been disastrous. Mugabe has presided over the collapse of Zimbabwe's economy and a dramatic decline in the living conditions of his people. At the end of 2008, Zimbabwe's economy reached a low point with world-record inflation, millions of people at risk of starvation, and unemployment over 90 percent. Meanwhile, Mugabe and his party have had to resort to increasing violence to repress the will of the people. Most recently, following the March 2008 election, the Mugabe regime and its cronies launched a brutal campaign of violence against members and supporters of the opposition MDC after Morgan Tsvangirai won the first round of voting.

I have closely followed the situation in Zimbabwe since 1999 when I traveled to Harare and witnessed then the early stages of this political crisis. During that trip, I also met some incredibly dynamic, committed and inspiring civil society leaders. Upon returning, I said on the Senate floor that we must not abandon these leaders; that the international community should move to arrest Zimbabwe's descent before it became more complex. I teamed up then with Senator Bill Frist to author legislation on U.S. policy toward Zimbabwe.

And in 2001, President Bush signed that legislation, the Zimbabwe Democracy and Economic Recovery Act, into law. ZDERA, as that bill is known, placed restrictions on U.S. support for any new international loan, credit or debt reduction for Zimbabwe until the President certifies that a number of political conditions have been met, namely an end to abuses and the restoration of rule of law. The bill also called for targeted sanctions against individuals responsible for politically motivated violence.

At the same time, ZDERA also spelled out the United States' commitment to the Zimbabwean people in their struggle to effect peaceful and democratic change. And it stated our commitment to be a strong partner in helping the Zimbabwean people to rebuild their country when that change was achieved. I have not given up on that commitment, despite the Mugabe regime's relentless and violent efforts to hold onto power. In 2002, I tried to return to the country, but my visa was revoked and the government blocked my entry into the country. In 2003, I traveled to South Africa and Botswana, in part to discuss the crisis in Zimbabwe and the regional consequences. Most recently, in 2008 and 2009, in my capacity as the Chairman of the Africa Subcommittee, I have held hearings specifically on Zimbabwe and U.S. policy options.

With the signing of the GPA, I was skeptical that Robert Mugabe and his allies had any real intention to share power and respect the agreement. I remain skeptical as at almost every turn, hardliners in the transitional government have resisted any moves that would undermine their historic patronage system and power structures. Mugabe has refused to implement several parts of the agreement, continuing to use Western sanctions as a scapegoat. Meanwhile, state security forces remain largely under the control of ZANU-PF and continue to harass civil society activists and participate in illegal, often violent, seizures of private land and property. In this sense, little has changed in Zimbabwe.

Yet at the same time, for many Zimbabweans, the establishment of a transitional government that includes former opposition leaders who were imprisoned and tortured as part of Zimbabwe's democratic struggle has brought forth a sense of possibility that has not existed for years. It has brought their struggle for democracy into the halls of government. And over the last year, some progress has been made toward enacting reforms. Most notably, the Finance Ministry has managed to halt Zimbabwe's economic decline and put an end to some of the disastrous fiscal activities of the previous regime. That said, progress has been slow and limited mostly to the economic sector. We cannot deceive ourselves into thinking that the return of food and other goods to stores is an indication that true democracy has taken root. Reformist elements in the government continue to lack the leverage as well as the qualified personnel and resources to overcome the resistance of hardliners and to break their hold on the security sector. They need greater support if they are going to win this struggle and achieve a genuine transition to democracy and economic recovery.

I respect those who are cautious about changing the international posture toward Zimbabwe until there is greater progress and a clear transition underway. I too am cautious, as there is good reason to be so. But at the same time, I also believe we must support the Zimbabwean people in their ongoing struggle for peaceful, democratic change and we can best do that by reconsidering some of the strict polices of years prior. We must realize that the dynamics of that struggle have changed—not as much as we would like them to go, not even close but there has been change. Adhering to a strict wait-and-see approach allows Mugabe and his allies to continue to marginalize reformers in the transitional government and manipulate the political environment, while relying on their usual anti-Western propaganda to win local and regional support. Alternatively, through proactive and targeted engagement, there may be ways that we can better support reformers in government, create incentives for others in the government to embrace such reform, and isolate the hardliners. If we are to see institutional change in Zimbabwe, it is in our interest to pursue those possibilities.

The United States has a key role to play in this regard. We continue to be very active in Zimbabwe, providing humanitarian assistance and support for civil society. In Fiscal Year 2009, the United States provided nearly $300 million to Zimbabwe, over half of which was food assistance. Over the last year, some within the administration have begun to explore ways we can better target our assistance to help reformers in order to consolidate democratic reforms and lay the groundwork for economic recovery. We have already provided some technical assistance to help certain ministries in the government. This is the right approach and we should continue to look for ways to proceed, both symbolically and substantively. At the same time, we should continue to update and increase targeted pressure on those individuals and institutions that are actively obstructing reform. We should also look for innovative ways to address illegal activities that are in violation of the GPA.

The Zimbabwe Transition to Democracy and Economic Recovery Act of 2010 seeks to encourage and provide the authority and flexibility for the Obama administration to pursue such a dynamic approach toward Zimbabwe. Our bill authorizes continued and expanded technical assistance to reformist ministries of the transitional government as well as to the Parliament as it seeks to repeal or amend repressive laws. It also amends the funding restrictions on Zimbabwe in the fiscal year 2010 State and Foreign Operations appropriations bill to allow for greater engagement in the areas of health and education. Furthermore, it encourages the United States to promote agricultural development as much as possible within our food assistance efforts, while we actively press the government to reestablish security of tenure for all landowners.

In addition, our bill would amend ZDERA to allow the United States greater flexibility and leverage when engaging with the International Financial Institutions on Zimbabwe. The law from 2001 restricts U.S. support for any international loan, credit or debt reduction to Zimbabwe until the President certifies that certain political conditions have been achieved in the country. This restriction currently has no discernible impact as Zimbabwe can only be eligible for such international support when it deals with its arrears, which now total billions of dollars. Nonetheless, this restriction has become a powerful symbol and it functionally ties the hands of the State and Treasury Departments to actively engage with the IMF, African Development Bank and other institutions to develop plans for supporting Zimbabwe's longer-term recovery when there is a genuine transition. Our bill would amend ZDERA to allow for such engagement, making U.S. support conditional on the proposed assistance itself, specifically whether there are sufficient controls for transparency and oversight, and whether funds will be administered by ministries that have demonstrated a commitment to reform.

Amending ZDERA will help to provide flexibility and leverage for the U.S. government, but also to undercut Mugabe's propaganda. Over the years, Mugabe and his allies have conveniently portrayed ZDERA as a symbol of Western hostility and blanket sanctions on Zimbabwe. While those allegations are clearly false, the changes made by our bill will go a long way towards ensuring they have a much harder time spinning this lie and deflecting responsibility from their own disastrous policies.

ZDERA, of course, is not to be conflated with our targeted sanctions against specific individuals and financial institutions that are directly involved in the breakdown of the rule of law and abuses of power. Our bill calls for the continuation of that program as I see no reason to terminate this sanctions program until we see an end to widespread abuses. Instead, our bill calls for the continued review and updating of those sanctions. It also encourages new action to address illegal activities involving diamonds in Zimbabwe that are reportedly fueling abuses and undermining democratic progress. Specifically, it urges the

Obama administration to consider new sanctions on individuals overseeing these activities and to press for Zimbabwe's suspension from the Kimberley Process. Zimbabwe's continued participation in the Kimberley Process undermines the integrity and important work of that process.

Finally, whenever it happens, Zimbabwe's next election will be a critical step toward any genuine transition to democratic rule and a sustainable economic recovery. The past elections have been flashpoints for increased violence and the breakdown of the rule of law. This cannot be the case this next time around if Zimbabwe is to move forward. The international community needs to prepare a coordinated strategy to help reduce the risk of violence and other abuses around such elections. Our bill directs the Obama administration to begin engaging with international partners now toward developing such a strategy.

International actions alone will not determine whether real and lasting democratic change is achieved in Zimbabwe; that will ultimately be determined by the Zimbabwean people themselves. But I do believe that we can help Zimbabweans pursue a genuine transition toward democracy and economic recovery. To do this, we need an approach that is flexible and responsive to evolving conditions and challenges on the ground. I believe this bill helps move us toward such an approach.

Nearly a decade ago, in passing ZDERA, the U.S. Congress committed to support the people of Zimbabwe in their struggle to effect peaceful, democratic change, achieve economic growth and restore the rule of law. Today, we can reaffirm that commitment by passing the Zimbabwe Transition to Democracy and Economic Recovery Act. I hope my colleagues will join us in doing so.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. KERRY, Mr. CARPER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 3299. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to allow all eligible voters to vote by mail in Federal elections; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I am introducing a package of three bills to improve the administration of U.S. elections. These bills would empower voters—giving them a greater ability to control how and when they participate in the electoral process. Just as technological developments have changed the way people manage everything from their bank accounts to their communication with friends and family, they can also give voters more power to control their involvement in the electoral process. By empowering individual voters, my bills would increase turnout and lower administrative costs, while improving the security and integrity of elections.

As my colleagues know, I am an ardent believer in bipartisanship. One thing both parties agree on is that the states are great laboratories for policy innovation. The bills I am introducing today are prime examples of progress that was pioneered at the state level. It's now time to take that proven success to the national level.

An increasing number of voters across the country now Vote by Mail. In fact, in the 2008 presidential election, one-fifth of ballots nationwide were cast by mail. I am proud to say that the State that blazed the trail for Vote by Mail is my home State of Oregon. There were many steps along this path, but the turning point came in 1996. That year, Oregon conducted its first State-wide primary and general election for a Federal race exclusively by mail. That election, of course, sent me to the U.S. Senate. But that election was not just a success for my campaign, it was a win for the voters of Oregon.

Through the success of Vote by Mail for that special election, folks in Oregon saw that elections could be conducted without long lines, malfunctioning equipment, and the risks of fraud inherent at polling places. The resounding success of that first Vote by Mail, State-wide, Federal election led directly to the passage of a referendum in Oregon on Vote by Mail two years later. In 1998, an overwhelming majority—70 percent—of Oregonians voted to adopt Vote by Mail for all elections. The Vote by Mail system was fully in place for the next election cycle, meaning that since 2000, all Oregon voters have voted exclusively by mail.

The three bills I am introducing today draw upon the success that Oregon has experienced with Vote by Mail and more recently with online voter registration. The first is the Universal Right to Vote by Mail Act. This bill would put into law the fact that every citizen has the right to vote by mail. Under this bill, any voter who requests an absentee ballot would receive one. No longer would arbitrary requirements block voters from choosing to Vote by Mail.

The second bill is the Vote by Mail Act. It would provide grants to states, or smaller jurisdictions, that wish to make the transition to Vote by Mail.

Finally, the Online Voter Registration Act would provide grants to states that wish to implement an online system that would allow voters to register to vote, update voter information, and request an absentee ballot using the internet. In Oregon, Washington, and Arizona, online systems are already working to reduce administrative costs and make it easier for voters to participate in elections.

Ten years of proven results with Oregon's Vote by Mail system has shown that this policy experiment has been a resounding success. Voters in Oregon strongly support Vote by Mail. An academic study conducted in 2005 found that over 80 percent of Oregonians prefer Vote by Mail to conventional polling place elections. Vote by Mail is also a more cost-effective way to run elections. In Oregon, the Elections Division estimated that costs were reduced by 30 percent when Vote by Mail replaced polling place elections.

One of the greatest results that Vote by Mail has had on Oregon's election is that it has increased voter turnout and that's an outcome that every state should want. In the three Presidential elections in Oregon since Vote by Mail was adopted, turnout has been 84 percent—an increase of 6 percent over the three prior Presidential elections. Vote by Mail has an even stronger beneficial impact on turnout for lower-profile elections, such as off-year, municipal, or referenda elections.

Vote by Mail also reduces election fraud. This may sound counter-intuitive to skeptics who believe voting by mail is less secure than voting at a polling place. However, a Vote by Mail system offers many safeguards that are not available in conventional elections. There is a paper trail for each and every vote, and the processing is conducted at a central, secure location that can be viewed by the public. By expanding the voting period—rather than compressing it into one day—Vote by Mail affords election officials the time to identify problems, fix errors, and investigate any questionable ballots. If the goal of our country's elections is to make sure the voice of every voter is heard clearly and securely, there is no greater tool than Vote by Mail.

Oregon's experience has shown that in a Vote by Mail system fraud is almost non-existent. Every ballot envelope is scrutinized before it is opened, and the voter's signature on it is reviewed to make sure it matches the one on file for the voter. With the longer time period involved—typically about two and a half weeks—in a Vote by Mail election, there is ample opportunity to determine whether a ballot is valid before it is counted and to investigate any allegations of fraud. If a ballot is fraudulent, it never gets counted. That could never happen in a polling place election where, by the time fraud is found, the vote has already been counted and can't be retrieved. Since Oregon converted to exclusive Vote by Mail elections, over 15 million ballots have been cast. During this time, thousands of ballots have been challenged and investigated for allegations of fraud. Thorough investigation of every allegation, however, has revealed only nine instances of vote fraud. There has been absolutely no evidence of any large-scale, systemic vote fraud that some predicted when Vote by Mail was first adopted in Oregon.

Vote by Mail offers additional advantages that may not be readily apparent. For example, on Election Day in 2006, Tillamook County, Oregon, experienced a deluge of 13 inches of rain. Roads were closed, parts of the county

became unreachable, and a State of emergency was declared. Even so, 70 percent of the voters in Tillamook County cast their ballots. Vote by Mail ensured that lack of access to polling places because of a natural disaster on Election Day was no impediment to voting.

It is not only bad weather that can be overcome with Vote by Mail—an illness, caring for a loved one, pregnancy, work, travel, or religious obligations can all keep citizens from exercising their right to vote at a polling place on a one-day election. Vote by Mail trumps all of these obstacles. Such barriers are not an issue in Oregon, but they may prevent voters in 28 states and territories from voting. In those states and territories, voters must meet arbitrary requirements to get an absentee ballot. I believe the decision to obtain an absentee ballot should be made by the voter. I can see no justification for allowing arbitrary, bureaucratic rules to disenfranchise any voter anywhere in America.

I would also note that excuse requirements for obtaining an absentee ballot constitute an unwarranted invasion of voter privacy. All information submitted on an absentee ballot request form becomes part of the public record. There is no reason why voters should be forced to reveal sensitive personal information simply to have the opportunity to vote. I believe all voters should enjoy equal access to mail ballots while having their privacy ensured.

That is why I am introducing the Universal Right to Vote by Mail Act. This bill is, fundamentally, about access and fairness. No citizen should have to miss an election because they have to work, are ill, are caring for a loved one, traveling, or have a religious obligation. When voting for President, Oregonians shouldn't have an advantage over New Yorkers or Virginians. The Universal Right to Vote by Mail Act doesn't force anyone to Vote by Mail, nor does it require states to implement any new voting systems. All States are already required to have an absentee ballot system. This bill merely says all voters should have equal protection in choosing how to participate in elections.

I am also introducing today the Vote by Mail Act of 2010, which would create a three-year, $18 million grant program to help states, or smaller jurisdictions, transition to Vote by Mail systems like the one in Oregon. This bill would not mandate that any state adopt Vote by Mail. However, the bill would provide funding for state or local jurisdictions that choose to take advantage of the benefits that Vote by Mail offers. The bill would provide grants of $2 million dollars to states, or grants of $1 million to smaller jurisdictions, to help pay for the costs of implementing a Vote by Mail system. I believe Vote by Mail can improve elections in any state that adopts it. But rather than simply assume that Vote by Mail delivers benefits, I offer a solution that would provide proof that it does. My bill would instruct the Government Accountability Office to evaluate Vote by Mail and produce a study comparing traditional voting methods with Vote by Mail.

Finally, I am introducing the Online Voter Registration Act to help give voters the ability to register, update voter information, and request absentee ballots using the internet. This bill would empower voters and would reduce administrative costs. In 2008, three quarters of folks in our country reported using the internet, and 87 percent of young adults did so. These are the very people who will be registering to vote for the first time, and they expect the government to accommodate the way they live their lives. But this bill isn't just about making things easier for young adults. The internet is well-suited to this work and can save time, protect voters' privacy, reduce paper, and lower costs. Many States already allow citizens to renew their driver's licenses or register their cars online. Expanding the list of those government services offered online to Voter Registration simply makes sense.

Oregon, Washington, and Arizona have already established online voter registration systems. In the initial election cycle of implementation for Washington's system, the State reported saving over $87,000 in less than a year. Expanding access to online voter registration makes sense, but designing and implementing such systems requires considerable start-up expenses. That's why the Online Voter Registration Act would provide grants of $150,000 to States to help cover the implementation costs.

I would like to thank those who have supported Vote by Mail, including the original cosponsors of the two bills: Senators KERRY, CARPER, CANTWELL, MERKLEY, and GILLIBRAND. I would also like to thank the many organizations that support Vote by Mail, including the National Association of Letter Carriers, National Association of Postmasters, National Association of Postal Supervisors, American Postal Workers Union, National Postal Mail Handlers Union, National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, and other labor organizations including the AFL–CIO and SEIU. Vote by Mail also has the support of many civil rights and elections organizations, including Common Cause, the NAACP, the ACLU, and The League of Rural Voters.

I urge my colleagues to give voters more choice and greater opportunity to participate in elections by supporting these important bills. It's time to move the nation's elections systems into the 21st century and answer the needs of today's voters. These bills are an important step in that direction.

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

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

S. 3299

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Universal Right to Vote by Mail Act of 2010''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) An inequity of voting rights exists in the United States because voters in some States have the universal right to vote by mail while voters in other States do not.

(2) Many voters often have work, family, or other commitments that make getting to polls on the date of an election difficult or impossible. Under current State laws, many of these voters are not permitted to vote by mail.

(3) 28 States currently allow universal absentee voting (also known as ''no-excuse'' absentee voting), which permits any voter to request a mail-in ballot without providing a reason for the request, and no State which has implemented no-excuse absentee voting has repealed it.

(4) Voting by mail gives voters more time to consider their choices, which is especially important as many ballots contain greater numbers of questions about complex issues than in the past due to the expanded use of the initiative and referendum process in many States.

(5) Voting by mail is cost effective. After the State of Oregon adopted vote by mail for all voters, the cost to administer an election in the State dropped by nearly 30 percent over the next few elections, from $3.07 per voter to $2.21 per voter.

(6) Allowing all voters the option to vote by mail can reduce waiting times for those voters who choose to vote at the polls.

(7) Voting by mail is preferable to many voters as an alternative to going to the polls. Voting by mail has become increasingly popular with voters who want to be certain that they are able to vote no matter what comes up on Election Day.

(8) No evidence exists suggesting the potential for fraud in absentee balloting is greater than the potential for fraud by any other method of voting.

(9) Many of the reasons which voters in many States are required to provide in order to vote by mail require the revelation of personal information about health, travel plans, or religious activities, which violate voters' privacy while doing nothing to prevent voter fraud.

(10) State laws which require voters to obtain a notary signature to vote by mail only add cost and inconvenience to voters without increasing security.

SEC. 3. PROMOTING ABILITY OF VOTERS TO VOTE BY MAIL IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle A of title III of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 15481 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 303 the following new section:

''SEC. 303A. PROMOTING ABILITY OF VOTERS TO VOTE BY MAIL.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—If an individual in a State is eligible to cast a vote in an election for Federal office, the State may not impose any additional conditions or requirements on the eligibility of the individual to cast the vote in such election by mail, except to the extent that the State imposes a deadline for requesting the ballot and related voting materials from the appropriate State or local election official and for returning the ballot to the appropriate State or local election official.

''(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subsection (a) shall be construed to affect the authority of States to conduct elections for Federal office through the use of polling places at which individuals cast ballots on the date of the election.

''(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—A State shall be required to comply with the requirements of subsection (a) with respect to elections for Federal office held in years beginning with 2012.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT RELATING TO ENFORCEMENT.—Section 401 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 15511) is amended by striking ''and 303'' and inserting ''303, and 303A''.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for such Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 303 the following new item:

''Sec. 303A. Promoting ability of voters to vote by mail.''.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. KERRY, Mr. CARPER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 3300. A bill to establish a Vote by Mail grant program; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

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

S. 3300

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Vote by Mail Act of 2010''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Supreme Court declared in Reynolds v. Sims that ''[i]t has been repeatedly recognized that all qualified voters have a constitutionally protected right to vote . . . and to have their votes counted.''

(2) In recent presidential elections, voting technology failures, procedural irregularities, and long lines for polling places deprived some Americans of their fundamental right to vote.

(3) Under the Oregon Vote by Mail system, election officials mail ballots to all registered voters at least 2 weeks before election day. Voters mark their ballots, seal the ballots in both unmarked secrecy envelopes and signed return envelopes, and return the ballots by mail or to secure drop boxes. Once a ballot is received, election officials scan the bar code on the ballot envelope, which brings up the voter's signature on a computer screen. The election official compares the signature on the screen and the signature on the ballot envelope. Only if the signature on the ballot envelope is determined to be authentic is the ballot forwarded on to be counted.

(4) Oregon's Vote by Mail system has deterred voter fraud because the system includes numerous security measures such as the signature authentication system. Potential misconduct is also discouraged by the power of the State to punish those who engage in voter fraud with up to 5 years in prison, $100,000 in fines, and the loss of their vote.

(5) Oregon's Vote by Mail system promotes uniformity and strict compliance with Federal and State voting laws because ballot processing is centralized in county clerks' offices, rather than at numerous polling places.

(6) Vote by Mail is 1 factor making voter turnout in Oregon consistently higher than the average national voter turnout. In the 2004 presidential election, for example, Oregon had a turnout rate of 86.48 percent of registered voters, compared to 69.96 percent turnout of registered voters nationally.

(7) Women, younger voters, and homemakers also report that they vote more often using Vote by Mail.

(8) Vote by Mail reduces election costs by eliminating the need to transport equipment to polling stations and to hire and train poll workers. Oregon reduced its costs to administer elections by nearly 30 percent after implementing Vote by Mail. In Oregon's last polling place election in 1998, the cost per voter was $3.07. By 2004, the cost per voter in Oregon had dropped to $2.21.

(9) Vote by Mail allows voters to educate themselves because they receive ballots well before election day, which provides them with ample time to research issues, study ballots, and deliberate in a way that is not possible at a polling place.

(10) Vote by Mail is accurate—at least 2 studies comparing voting technologies show that absentee voting methods, including Vote by Mail systems, result in a more accurate vote count.

(11) Vote by Mail results in more up-to-date voter rolls, since election officials use forwarding information from the post office to update voter registration.

(12) Vote by Mail allows voters to visually verify that their votes were cast correctly and produces a paper trail for election recounts.

(13) In a survey taken 5 years after Oregon implemented the Vote by Mail system, more than 8 in 10 Oregon voters said they preferred voting by mail to traditional voting.

(14) Voters in other States are moving toward Vote by Mail as well. In 2008, 89 percent of voters in Washington State who cast ballots voted by mail, 64 percent of voters in Colorado voted by mail, and 44 percent of voters in California voted by mail.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ELECTION.—The term ''election'' means any general, special, primary, or runoff election.

(2) PARTICIPATING STATE.—The term ''participating State'' means a State receiving a grant under the Vote by Mail grant program under section 4.

(3) RESIDUAL VOTE RATE.—The term ''residual vote rate'' means the sum of all votes that cannot be counted in an election (overvotes, undervotes, and otherwise spoiled ballots) divided by the total number of votes cast.

(4) STATE.—The term ''State'' means a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or a territory or possession of the United States.

(5) VOTING SYSTEM.—The term ''voting system'' has the meaning given such term under section 301(b) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 15481(b)).

SEC. 4. VOTE BY MAIL GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Election Assistance Commission shall establish a Vote by Mail grant program (in this section referred to as the ''program'').

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the program is to make implementation grants to participating States solely for the implementation of procedures for the conduct of all elections by mail at the State or local government level.

(c) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—In no case may grants made under this section be used to reimburse a State for costs incurred in implementing mail-in voting for elections at the State or local government level if such costs were incurred prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) APPLICATION.—A State seeking to participate in the program under this section shall submit an application to the Election Assistance Commission containing such information, and at such time, as the Election Assistance Commission may specify.

(e) AMOUNT AND AWARDING OF IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS; DURATION OF PROGRAM.—

(1) AMOUNT OF IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the amount of an implementation grant made to a participating State shall be, in the case of a State that certifies that it will implement all elections by mail in accordance with the requirements of subsection (f), with respect to—

(i) the entire State, $2,000,000; or

(ii) any single unit or multiple units of local government within the State, $1,000,000.

(B) EXCESS FUNDS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—To the extent that there are excess funds in either of the first 2 years of the program, such funds may be used to award implementation grants to participating States in subsequent years.

(ii) EXCESS FUNDS DEFINED.—For purposes of clause (i), the term ''excess funds'' means any amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization under subsection (h)(1) with respect to a fiscal year that are not awarded to a participating State under an implementation grant during such fiscal year.

(C) CONTINUING AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS AFTER APPROPRIATION.—An implementation grant made to a participating State under this section shall be available to the State without fiscal year limitation.

(2) AWARDING OF IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Election Assistance Commission shall award implementation grants during each year in which the program is conducted.

(B) ONE GRANT PER STATE.—The Election Assistance Commission shall not award more than 1 implementation grant to any participating State under this section over the duration of the program.

(3) DURATION.—The program shall be conducted for a period of 3 years.

(f) REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) REQUIRED PROCEDURES.—A participating State shall establish and implement procedures for conducting all elections by mail in the area with respect to which it receives an implementation grant to conduct such elections, including the following:

(A) A process for recording electronically each voter's registration information and signature.

(B) A process for mailing ballots to all eligible voters.

(C) The designation of places for the deposit of ballots cast in an election.

(D) A process for ensuring the secrecy and integrity of ballots cast in the election.

(E) Procedures and penalties for preventing election fraud and ballot tampering, including procedures for the verification of the signature of the voter accompanying the ballot through comparison of such signature with the signature of the voter maintained by the State in accordance with subparagraph (A).

(F) Procedures for verifying that a ballot has been received by the appropriate authority.

(G) Procedures for obtaining a replacement ballot in the case of a ballot which is destroyed, spoiled, lost, or not received by the voter.

(H) A plan for training election workers in signature verification techniques.

(I) Plans and procedures to ensure that voters who are blind, visually-impaired, or

otherwise disabled have the opportunity to participate in elections conducted by mail and to ensure compliance with the Help America Vote Act of 2002. Such plans and procedures shall be developed in consultation with disabled and other civil rights organizations, voting rights groups, State election officials, voter protection groups, and other interested community organizations.

(J) Plans and procedures to ensure the translation of ballots and voting materials in accordance with section 203 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 1973aa–1a)).

(g) BEST PRACTICES, TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, AND REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Election Assistance Commission shall—

(A) develop, periodically issue, and, as appropriate, update best practices for conducting elections by mail;

(B) provide technical assistance to participating States for the purpose of implementing procedures for conducting elections by mail; and

(C) submit to the appropriate committees of Congress—

(i) annual reports on the implementation of such procedures by participating States during each year in which the program is conducted; and

(ii) upon completion of the program conducted under this section, a final report on the program, together with recommendations for such legislation or administrative action as the Election Assistance Commission determines to be appropriate.

(2) CONSULTATION.—In developing, issuing, and updating best practices, developing materials to provide technical assistance to participating States, and developing the annual and final reports under paragraph (1), the Election Assistance Commission shall consult with interested parties, including—

(A) State and local election officials;

(B) the United States Postal Service;

(C) the Postal Regulatory Commission established under section 501 of title 39, United States Code; and

(D) voting rights groups, voter protection groups, groups representing the disabled, and other civil rights or community organizations.

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) GRANTS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to award grants under this section, for each of fiscal years 2012 through 2014, $6,000,000, to remain available without fiscal year limitation until expended.

(2) ADMINISTRATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to administer the program under this section, $200,000 for the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2014, to remain available without fiscal year limitation until expended.

(i) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act may be construed to authorize or require conduct prohibited under any of the following laws, or to supersede, restrict, or limit the application of such laws:

(1) The Help America Vote Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 15301 et seq.).

(2) The Voting Rights Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 1973 et seq.).

(3) The Voting Accessibility for the Elderly and Handicapped Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ee et seq.).

(4) The Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff et seq.).

(5) The National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 1973gg et seq.).

(6) The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.).

(7) The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 701 et seq.).

SEC. 5. STUDY ON IMPLEMENTATION OF MAIL-IN VOTING FOR ELECTIONS.

(a) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States (in this section referred to as the ''Comptroller General'') shall conduct a study evaluating the benefits of broader implementation of mail-in voting in elections, taking into consideration the annual reports submitted by the Election Assistance Commission under section 4(g)(1)(C)(i) before November 1, 2013.

(2) SPECIFIC ISSUES STUDIED.—The study conducted under paragraph (1) shall include a comparison of traditional voting methods and mail-in voting with respect to—

(A) the likelihood of voter fraud and misconduct;

(B) the accuracy of voter rolls;

(C) the accuracy of election results;

(D) voter participation in urban and rural communities and by minorities, language minorities (as defined in section 203 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 1973aa–1a)), and individuals with disabilities and by individuals who are homeless or who frequently change their official residences;

(E) public confidence in the election system;

(F) the residual vote rate, including such rate based on voter age, education, income, race, or ethnicity or whether a voter lives in an urban or rural community, is disabled, or is a language minority (as so defined); and

(G) cost savings.

(3) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the study under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General shall consult with interested parties, including—

(A) State and local election officials;

(B) the United States Postal Service;

(C) the Postal Regulatory Commission established under section 501 of title 39, United States Code; and

(D) voting rights groups, voter protection groups, groups representing the disabled, and other civil rights or community organizations.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than November 1, 2013, the Comptroller General shall prepare and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the study conducted under subsection (a), together with such recommendations for legislation or administrative action as the Comptroller General determines to be appropriate.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. KERRY):

S. 3301. A bill to establish an Online Voter Registration grant program; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

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

S. 3301

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Online Voter Registration Act of 2010''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Americans have become increasingly comfortable with using the Internet for a wide range of purposes, including gathering information, purchasing items, performing financial transactions, and obtaining information and services from the Government.

(2) In 2008, 74 percent of adults in the United States reported using the Internet, according to the Pew Internet and American Life Project. Of those adults, 89 percent reported using the Internet to find information, 71 percent made purchases over the Internet, 70 percent read news online, 56 percent looked up campaign or political information, 55 percent utilized online banking, and 59 percent visited Government Internet websites.

(3) The Internet is well-suited to allow individuals to provide and update personal information. Completing such tasks online saves time, reduces paper, increases efficiency, and lowers costs.

(4) Many States already allow citizens to access Government services online, including renewing driver's licenses and registering cars.

(5) Two States, Arizona and Washington, have already implemented online voter registration systems, and a number of other States are in the process of adopting online voter registration systems.

(6) Although 2008 was the first election cycle that the online voter registration system was in place in Washington State, in the month prior to the general election, voter use of the online voter registration system exceeded that of mail-in registration cards by more than 20 percent.

(7) Younger adults who are registering to vote for the first time are the most adept Internet users and expect to be able to accomplish most tasks online. In 2008, 87 percent of adults age 18 to 29 used the Internet. In Washington State, voters age 18 to 24 had the highest rate of use of its online voter registration system.

(8) During the 2008 election cycle, Washington State processed about 130,000 online voter registration transactions.

(9) Implementing an online voter registration requires an initial investment to purchase the needed technology and to input existing voter information into the registration database. Washington State, for example, spent $278,000 to establish its online voter registration system.

(10) Once in place, online voter registration systems allow the processing of new voter registrations, changes of address or party, and requests for absentee ballots.

(11) Washington State reports that it costs approximately 25 cents to process paper voter registration cards and 43 cents to process those submitted via the department of motor vehicles in compliance with the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 1973gg et seq.). Voters must also pay postage costs for registration cards sent through the mail. Once in place, the online voter registration system requires no processing by staff in order to complete a transaction, and therefore has no per transaction cost. For the 2008 general election, the online voter registration system saved Washington State $32,500, and saved consumers $54,600 in postage costs, which resulted in total savings to the State and consumers of over $87,000.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ELECTION.—The term ''election'' means any general, special, primary, or runoff election.

(2) PARTICIPATING STATE.—The term ''participating State'' means a State receiving a grant under the Online Voter Registration grant program under section 4.

(3) STATE.—The term ''State'' means a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or a territory or possession of the United States.

SEC. 4. ONLINE VOTER REGISTRATION GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Election Assistance Commission shall establish an Online Voter Registration grant program (in this section referred to as the ''program'').

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the program is to make grants to participating States solely for the implementation of online voter registration systems.

(c) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—In no case may grants made under this section be used to reimburse a State for costs incurred in implementing online voter registration systems at the State or local government level if such costs were incurred prior to October 1, 2009.

(d) APPLICATION.—A State seeking to participate in the program under this section shall submit an application to the Election Assistance Commission containing such information, and at such time, as the Election Assistance Commission may specify.

(e) AMOUNT AND AWARDING OF IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS; DURATION OF PROGRAM.—

(1) AMOUNT OF IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The amount of an implementation grant made to a participating State shall be $150,000.

(B) CONTINUING AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS AFTER APPROPRIATION.—An implementation grant made to a participating State under this section shall be available to the State without fiscal year limitation.

(2) AWARDING OF IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Election Assistance Commission shall award implementation grants during each year in which the program is conducted.

(B) ONE GRANT PER STATE.—The Election Assistance Commission shall not award more than 1 implementation grant to any participating State under this section over the duration of the program.

(3) DURATION.—The program shall be conducted for a period of 5 years.

(f) REQUIREMENTS.—A participating State shall establish and implement an online voter registration system which individuals may use to register to vote, update voter registration information, and request an absentee ballot in the State.

(g) BEST PRACTICES, TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, AND REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Election Assistance Commission shall—

(A) develop, periodically issue, and, as appropriate, update best practices for implementing online voter registration systems;

(B) provide technical assistance to participating States for the purpose of implementing online voter registration systems; and

(C) submit to the appropriate committees of Congress—

(i) annual reports on the implementation of such online voter registration systems by participating States during each year in which the program is conducted; and

(ii) upon completion of the program conducted under this section, a final report on the program, together with recommendations for such legislation or administrative action as the Election Assistance Commission determines to be appropriate.

(2) CONSULTATION.—In developing, issuing, and updating best practices, developing materials to provide technical assistance to participating States, and developing the annual and final reports under paragraph (1), the Election Assistance Commission shall consult with interested parties, including—

(A) State and local election officials; and

(B) voting rights groups, voter protection groups, groups representing the disabled, and other civil rights or community organizations.

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) GRANTS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to award grants under this section, for each of fiscal years 2010 through 2016, $1,800,000, to remain available without fiscal year limitation until expended.

(2) ADMINISTRATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to administer the program under this section, $200,000 for the period of fiscal years 2010 through 2016, to remain available without fiscal year limitation until expended.

(i) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act may be construed to authorize or require conduct prohibited under any of the following laws, or to supersede, restrict, or limit the application of such laws:

(1) The Help America Vote Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 15301 et seq.).

(2) The Voting Rights Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 1973 et seq.).

(3) The Voting Accessibility for the Elderly and Handicapped Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ee et seq.).

(4) The Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff et seq.).

(5) The National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 1973gg et seq.).

(6) The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.).

(7) The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 701 et seq.).

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 513—DESIGNATING JULY 9, 2010, AS ''COLLECTOR CAR APPRECIATION DAY'' AND RECOGNIZING THAT THE COLLECTION AND RESTORATION OF HISTORIC AND CLASSIC CARS IS AN IMPORTANT PART OF PRESERVING THE TECHNOLOGICAL ACHIEVEMENTS AND CULTURAL HERITAGE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. BURR) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 513

Whereas many people in the United States maintain classic automobiles as a pastime and do so with great passion and as a means of individual expression;

Whereas the Senate recognizes the effect that the more than 100-year history of the automobile has had on the economic progress of the Nation and supports wholeheartedly all activities involved in the restoration and exhibition of classic automobiles;

Whereas collection, restoration, and preservation of automobiles is an activity shared across generations and across all segments of society;

Whereas thousands of local car clubs and related businesses have been instrumental in preserving a historic part of the heritage of this Nation by encouraging the restoration and exhibition of such vintage works of art;

Whereas automotive restoration provides well-paying, high-skilled jobs for people in all 50 States; and

Whereas automobiles have provided the inspiration for music, photography, cinema, fashion, and other artistic pursuits that have become part of the popular culture of the United States: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates July 9, 2010, as ''Collector Car Appreciation Day'';

(2) recognizes that the collection and restoration of historic and classic cars is an important part of preserving the technological achievements and cultural heritage of the United States;

(3) encourages the Department of Education, the Department of Transportation, and other Federal agencies to support events and commemorations of ''Collector Car Appreciation Day'', including exhibitions and educational and cultural activities for young people; and

(4) encourages the people of the United States to engage in events and commemorations of ''Collector Car Appreciation Day'' that create opportunities for collector car owners to educate young people on the importance of preserving the cultural heritage of the United States, including through the collection and restoration of collector cars.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3785. Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3739 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. DODD (for himself and Mrs. LINCOLN)) to the bill S. 3217, to promote the financial stability of the United States by improving accountability and transparency in the financial system, to end ''too big to fail'', to protect the American taxpayer by ending bailouts, to protect consumers from abusive financial services practices, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3786. Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. SANDERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3739 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. DODD (for himself and Mrs. LINCOLN)) to the bill S. 3217, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3787. Mr. BROWN of Ohio (for himself and Mr. KAUFMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3739 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. DODD (for himself and Mrs. LINCOLN)) to the bill S. 3217, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3788. Mr. KOHL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3739 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. DODD (for himself and Mrs. LINCOLN)) to the bill S. 3217, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3789. Mr. BROWNBACK (for himself, Mr. BOND, and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3739 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. DODD (for himself and Mrs. LINCOLN)) to the bill S. 3217, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3790. Mr. BROWNBACK (for himself, Mr. BOND, and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3739 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. DODD (for himself and Mrs. LINCOLN)) to the bill S. 3217, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3791. Mr. BROWNBACK (for himself, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3739 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. DODD (for himself and Mrs. LINCOLN)) to the bill S. 3217, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3792. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3739 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. DODD (for himself and Mrs. LINCOLN)) to the bill S. 3217, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3793. Mrs. MCCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 3217, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3794. Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SPECTER, and Mr. KAUFMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 3217, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.