

to that company. And this is in addition to a \$20 million retirement package paid to him by Halliburton after only 5 years of employment that he held with that company and a \$1.4 million cash bonus paid to him in Halliburton in 2001, and additional millions of dollars of compensation paid to him while he was employed by the company.

Now, compare that to the people in our country who are losing their jobs and those we are having to fight for here on this floor to get extensions of unemployment benefits. One of the aspects of the job loss in our country and related to the trade deficit with China and with all of the nations is the fact that when these countries, the people in these countries sell us goods, financially our dollars go back to that country and the companies in that country. And it is very interesting what they do with their dollars. First of all, they purchase pieces of us so that the brain of the corporation is no longer located in this country, but rather wherever those companies are located which means that we become a derivative economy.

Secondly, those dollars that end up in the hands of foreign interests are being used to purchase our public debt. And one of the hidden aspects of this horrendous trade deficit that we are racking up is that countries like Japan and China and the Middle Eastern oil kingdoms are buying larger and larger pieces of us. In fact, they now own well over a trillion dollars of our debt on which we are paying them interest.

Is that not a fine how do you do?

According to the latest year for which I have figures, we paid over \$85 billion in interest to these foreign creditors to the United States, the largest being Japan. In 2001, we paid her \$26.1 billion of our tax money. Those are dollars we did not pay to our citizens. We did not sell savings bonds to our citizens and ask them to pay the interest to them. We paid the interest to Japan, which will not open our markets to their products and continues to exclude our suppliers in their automotive supply chain, but we paid them \$26.1 billion.

We paid China and Hong Kong, this was back in 2001, before this deficit was going up as much as it is now. It was horrendous back then, but it is getting worse. We paid China back then over \$10 billion, \$10 billion. So just China and Japan alone we had over \$36.5 billion in interest. That is more money than we put into NASA. In one year NASA's budget is about \$14.5 billion. We could run three NASAs for what we are paying just in interest to Japan and China.

Now, to the oil kingdoms we paid over \$6.7 billion, \$6.7 billion. Could that not put a lot of our young people through college? Could that not educate new doctors for the future for free, for free? We could pay for their tuition and ask them to serve in the underserved areas of this country.

We paid Korea and Taiwan \$5.6 billion. So if you total everything up, \$85 billion in interest as of 2 years ago to these foreign creditors, people who are buying our debt because we cannot self-finance anymore. The hole of the debt is getting bigger and bigger. We cannot even buy it ourselves. We are pawning it off to foreign interests. Literally, it has gotten so bad that nearly half of the Treasury securities that are sold every year in our country are being purchased by foreign interests.

So the share of foreign ownership of our debt is growing every year. Because when these countries that are responsible for our trade deficit end up getting our dollars, they buy a piece of us. Think about that; \$85 billion dollars, we could take care of all the disability compensation for our veterans. We could increase hazard pay for our young men and women in the Armed Forces who are giving their lives every day. We had a measure on the floor last week for \$1,500 which was defeated despite our objections. We could triple it.

We could take care of TRICARE for our Guard and Reserve and the families who are part of that system. The Republican leadership will not allow that bill on the floor. We could create a real whole health care system for not just active duty but for our Guard and Reserve across this country.

We could build new water systems all over this country for \$85 billion. Only a portion of that would it take to modernize water systems under every city in this country. So the cost of this kind of trade deficit with China, with all of the other countries, the lost jobs here at home, and then the insidious erosion of our own financial independence, because of the transfer of those dollars to others would then essentially weaken us because we end up owing them rather than paying bills when they come due.

Mr. Speaker, in closing this evening I think it is important to place on the record our deep concerns about the Bush administration wanting to expand NAFTA to include all of Latin America. As the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) has indicated, if we had a balanced trade account with Mexico and with Canada as a result of NAFTA, would it not make sense to do that? But, in fact, after NAFTA's passage, we went into a gigantic deficit with Mexico, the largest in our history, the same with Canada, which means that we are sucking in imports with these countries when, in fact, they promised us with NAFTA that we would be creating jobs in our country by exporting to those countries. That is not happening. It is working exactly the reverse, both in industry and in agriculture.

Now the Bush administration wants to use that flawed template in order to expand to a larger portion of the hemisphere. In whose interest is that? When the original NAFTA is not working, why would you want to expand it? Why do you not fix it so that we do not con-

tinue to hemorrhage more jobs and continue to fritter away our financial independence as a Nation?

CAFTA will be considered here before the end of the year or perhaps before next June, we are not sure; but we ought to think hard about not making the same mistake again and think about how we are go to repair these big holes of deficit that we are building both on the trade front and on the deficit front for our Treasury accounts.

Mr. Speaker, we will have more to say on the condition of the economy of the United States in the days and months ahead; but surely the Bush administration cannot be proud of its record, and surely we need leadership, new leadership here in Washington, to help us get our Nation in a stronger situation for the future generations than we have found it.

MANUFACTURING JOBS LOST: STATE-BY-STATE, SEPTEMBER 2003

State	Manufacturing jobs lost in September	Jobs lost since Jan. 2001
Alabama		39,500
Alaska	3,500	
Arizona		35,700
Arkansas		29,500
California		297,700
Colorado	1,700	38,900
Connecticut	900	33,500
Delaware		3,700
D.C.		700
Florida	900	59,200
Georgia	1,100	66,100
Hawaii		1,600
Idaho		6,400
Illinois	1,800	125,800
Indiana	2,200	67,200
Iowa		26,600
Kansas	300	22,000
Kentucky		33,600
Louisiana		21,600
Maine		15,500
Maryland	1,000	20,500
Massachusetts		78,500
Michigan	8,200	127,000
Minnesota		48,100
Mississippi		35,500
Missouri	600	40,900
Montana	100	3,900
Nebraska		9,600
Nevada		400
New Hampshire	500	21,700
New Jersey		63,500
New Mexico	100	6,400
New York	4,000	132,700
North Carolina	3,800	145,300
North Dakota	1,200	1,300
Ohio	5,800	151,800
Oklahoma		25,900
Oregon		28,900
Pennsylvania	2,200	132,500
Puerto Rico		17,700
Rhode Island	200	12,000
South Carolina	1,400	55,200
South Dakota	1,600	6,400
Tennessee	200	57,700
Texas	900	156,200
Utah		15,000
Vermont	700	9,500
Virginia	2,200	51,400
Washington	900	65,100
West Virginia	400	9,000
Wisconsin	3,200	73,100
Wyoming	100	1,200
Virgin Islands		300

□ 2145

HOW WILL YOU KNOW YOUR VOTE COUNTED ON ELECTION DAY?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) is recognized for 30 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may

have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on the subject of this special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be joined this evening by my colleague the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) and my colleague the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

Let me begin with a question. On Election Day, how will you know if your vote is properly counted? In many precincts, in many States around this country, the answer is you will not. Imagine, it is election day and you enter your polling place to cast your vote on a brand new electronic touch-screen voting machine. The screen is large; it is well lit; it is accessible if you have physical disabilities. Your choices are clearly spelled out before you. In fact, it looks as easy to use as the ATM at your bank. You breathe a sigh of relief that you no longer have to figure out a complicated butterfly ballot. It seems more modern than the old lever machines.

So you make your choice and you touch the submit button and cast your vote. The screen says your vote has been counted. You exit the polling place with a sense of satisfaction, and then you begin to wonder. How do I know if the machine actually recorded my vote the way I intended? The fact is you do not. You have to trust the software in the machine to be error free.

After the 2000 election, we in Congress recognized that we had to act to restore the integrity and reliability of our electoral system by making dimpled chads and other voting irregularities things of the past. Last October, we passed the Help America Vote Act, known as HAVA. It is groundbreaking election reform legislation that is currently helping States throughout the country replace antiquated and unreliable punch cards and other machines.

However, HAVA is having an unintended consequence. HAVA has done some good things. It is giving people with disabilities access, access that they have been denied for years. In fact, they have always been denied. HAVA is doing some great things, but it is leading a headlong rush by States and localities to purchase computer voting systems that suffer from a serious flaw. All models, even the most convenient and accessible, have the problem that once the voter touches the button, the voter has no way of knowing whether the vote has been counted as the voter intended. No one will ever know. It is a secret ballot and must be secret.

This uncertainty, this lack of confidence can be disastrous to voter confidence and can prevent an accurate recount and can be a step on the way to the undoing of our democracy. I am not an anti-technology Luddite. I am a physicist. I am something of a techie. I

see real advantages in these electronic machines.

There are several important advantages such as their accessibility if you have physical disabilities. Their speed and efficiency, so that the results will be communicated to the county clerk quickly. They are probably more reliable than the county clerk. I certainly had an experience with the clerk in my county when she awarded one precinct to my opponent by a margin of 9,000 votes when there were not 9,000 people who lived in that precinct. It was a simple pencil and paper clerical area. The electronic machines will do away with that, but there is one fundamental problem. They are inherently unverifiable.

To again make the point that this is not the concern of an anti-technology Luddite, I would say that hundreds of nationally renowned computer scientists have raised a cry of alarm, saying that unless there is an independent verification method to safeguard the accuracy and the integrity of the voting process there will be, might not might be, these computer scientists say there will be problems. There might be accidental software errors. There might be, God forbid, malicious hacking, and if there are concerns, if the voter is uncertain, if the candidate is uncertain whether the votes have been recorded the way they were cast, a recount is meaningless. The computer that has a faulty tally 2 minutes after the polls closed will have the same faulty tally a day later when the recount is held or the next month when the judge opens it up. If there are errors, they will go unnoticed and unknown.

The history of progress in our system of self-government here in America is in many ways a history of increasing the franchise, extending the right to vote and the ability to vote, increasing accessibility and reliability of the process of voting, but we still have some problems. We see declining voter turnout, and we have all heard, my colleagues here from Ohio I am sure have heard, constituents say, well, my vote does not count. Some people when they say that mean that special interests dominate the process and overwhelm my vote in secret back room deals. And we all work hard to see that that concern is removed, but they often mean something else when they say my vote does not count. They mean, literally, my vote does not count, my vote will not be counted.

The level of concern around the country is astounding. The Internet is burning up with back and forth chat of concerns about our voting process, and the loss of confidence in the process leads to a loss of failure to vote, leads to a cheapening and eventual breakdown of our democracy.

Every voter who stays home, whether it is because the voting places are physically inaccessible to them or because of a lack of trust in the voting process is a loss to democracy. We

must find, we must find a way to keep the voter directly connected to the verification process so the voter knows that her vote or his vote is the vote that is counted.

It is not good enough to give them reassurance that the manufacturer says the machine works fine. Without taking steps to return the verification to the voter and to restore trust in the process, we face a crisis, pure and simple.

I have with me someone who has paid close attention to the electoral process. My colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), was the Secretary of State of Ohio, and one of his responsibilities, as I believe, was to ensure the accuracy and the reliability of the voting system. And I think he understands, as well as anyone, the potential crisis we face or maybe it is not even potential anymore. I would be pleased to yield to my friend from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from New Jersey. I do not have the technical expertise that the gentleman, the physicist, has.

I, for 8 years, ran Ohio's election system, then the sixth largest election system in the country, an election system where we saw in Presidential elections 4.6 million Ohioans go to the polls. In gubernatorial years, we might see 3.2, 3.3 million people go to the polls. In primary and special elections, elections in odd number, mayoral years, township trustee year, we would see fewer people, but what underlined all of that, and I think my friend from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) spoke this very well, was how important confidence in the system is and whether it is everyone for everyone, confidence in an accurate count is paramount.

The confidence as far as the voter is concerned that my vote will be counted is paramount. Confidence that the candidates running for office or the advocates for the issues on the ballot or the opponents to the issues on the ballot, but all of the stakeholders, the players, the candidates, the participants they must be confident that the elections are held fairly and honestly. The media which cover the elections, which write about the elections, which analyze the elections, it is equally as important that the media have full confidence in the electoral process, that every vote is counted.

While the technology is different from my career in the 1980s, from 1983 up through 1990, certainly the technology is different, I also saw technology evolve during those 8 years I was Secretary of State. In some counties, when I began, they used a simple paper ballot. Some counties used a machine. Some counties used that punch card. We began to see new technologies, counties using different methods of casting votes and counting votes, but in every one of those cases, in every one of those counties, what stayed paramount was the confidence that the votes would be counted properly so that the voter had confidence,

the candidates had confidence and the media had confidence that this was a fair operation.

They were confident because we, as election officials, there were people that ran the State election system, that ran each local precinct, each polling place, each local board of election, we could show to them that votes, in fact, were counted fairly. We had paper trails. No matter how they were voting we were able to show that, yes, the votes were counted correctly.

We had plenty of people protest. We would have recounts, but during the recounts, people would be able to watch representatives of both sides to make sure the votes were counted fairly, and they always were in the end, and this is what my concern is.

I am not a Luddite anymore than my physicist friend from New Jersey is. I am not against progress. I do not have any of those fears, but I am concerned as I hear people in my District in both parties express those concerns that we are voting on computers, and we do not have paper trails in some of this equipment.

Then I hear some sort of irresponsible statements made by some executives from some companies who are active participants in these elections, and I hear comments from people I know around my State that that scares a little bit, and I do not think this is a question of fear, but it is a question of concern, and I am just asking this Congress to pay special attention to this whole process so that people can continue to have confidence in the election system.

Every election is a big election. This election next year, I think we will see the highest voter turnout we have had in decades because I think people have such strong feelings on all sides about the way the country is being run today, and I want to be able to say in good conscience, say next October as we lead into the November election, that I have full confidence in the way that votes will be cast and full confidence in the way that votes will be counted. It is what we owe the people. It is what our republic is based on, one person, one vote, and one person, one vote only works if every one of those one voters have the confidence in the election that they need to have.

So I thank my friend from New Jersey for his yeoman's work and leadership on this.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his insight, and he makes this important distinction about having confidence in the way the votes are cast and having confidence in the way the votes are counted, and it is not necessarily the same thing. It is the electronics inside the machine that connects those two, and it is that gap which makes them inherently unverifiable.

□ 2200

I have legislation that would, I believe, overcome this shortcoming. But

before I talk about the details, and I will not go through all the details, but before I outline that legislation, I would be pleased to yield to my friend, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), who has deep and strong concerns about this.

Ms. KAPTUR. I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) for his extraordinary leadership on this very, very important piece of legislation that he has introduced, H.R. 2239, taking his great intelligence and experience as a physicist and wedding it to his legislative experience here in the Congress and trying to help our Nation improve on the voting systems that we have, but to do so in a way that every voter will be confident that when they cast their ballot that their vote is really in there, in that machine.

In fact, I begin with that statement because one of the leading election officials in my own district said to me, Congresswoman, I do not have confidence that in what is being done right now that I can answer to the citizens of this county that their vote will be in there. How do they know it's in there? Give me the confidence that I know it's in there. I said, I am supporting Congressman HOLT's bill so that we get an auditable paper trail at every precinct.

I would say that in addition to being a U.S. Representative, which I was elected to rather later in life, the very first office I was ever elected to and still hold is precinct committeewoman in my own home precinct. Ohio is unlike some of the other States in the Union, but we value every vote at the precinct level. We count the votes at the precinct level. Under Ohio law when you cast your vote and there is a paper trail currently in every precinct in our county, over 500 of these precincts, the votes in that precinct are counted right there. They are not taken to another location. Both Democrats and Republicans count these votes together, and there are actual documents that they have to handle, physically handle and then tally and then those votes are both sent to the board of elections in a central location, but also posted on the door outside that precinct. Any voter can go and take that tally at the end of the day. We have a very transparent system, one in which our major parties have confidence. Every tally that is done in the voting logs that are assembled in every precinct, they are added up. Sometimes mistakes are made in the precincts in terms of the tallies but then those are caught at the central board of elections, and we try to really assure that the count is as fair as possible. If it is not, if people have any concern, if there is a one-vote margin in an election, you can go back to the paper trail and you can go back and see what was done in every single precinct in the county.

I wanted to say to the gentleman, I think that this verification is so extraordinarily important. What happened in Florida at the moment could

not happen in Ohio because in Florida they move their ballots to a counting station. They do not count in every precinct. Speaking as a Buckeye, speaking as an Ohioan, I do not want our rights taken away from us at the precinct level. I also would, if the gentleman will allow me, wish to place in the RECORD this evening for every election official in this country, at every county in the country, at every precinct, at every board of election, I have found great confusion as to what the Help America Vote Act actually requires and the Federal Election Commission on its Web site has what is required by the Federal law, every single year.

And indeed it is not until January 1, 2006, that every State and jurisdiction is required to comply with the voting systems requirements of the Help America Vote Act that we passed last year. Some people are under the impression that they have to have everything done by next year. They do not. They can get a waiver that they have to file with the Federal Election Commission this coming January. The secretaries of state of our country should have notified counties of this. But I can tell you, as I go out into my Ohio counties, the local boards of election simply do not know this. There is great concern and there is great consternation. I will place this in the RECORD.

I would also like to say to the gentleman from New Jersey, in addition to his bill which I hope we can pass expeditiously, I would urge our State legislatures to adopt no-fault absentee voting, that if there is any concern next year at any precinct or a doubt about the integrity of that machine, that voters can have an alternate way of casting a vote in that county through no-fault absentee voting or indeed even paper ballots at the same precincts, so that people have confidence that their vote will be counted.

Mr. HOLT. So that the voter can vote. If there is any question about eligibility or other questions about the vote, those will be settled later and the voter will be able to cast the vote on election day. That is what the gentlewoman means, I believe, by no-fault voting.

Ms. KAPTUR. That is what I mean. If I might just take one additional moment of the gentleman and then complete my remarks. One of the reasons I think this is important is when we passed the Help America Vote Act, the Bush administration was to have appointed an election commission that would set Federal standards for the development of the technologies that you know are so critical. They have not done that. In fact, the commission does not even exist, so there are no Federal regulations.

Mr. HOLT. The appointments have been made, but the other body has not acted and the commission does not yet exist.

Ms. KAPTUR. So there are no Federal standards. I can tell the gentleman

that in Ohio our secretary of state displayed five different technologies in our State House. I sent down a computer security team from our region in the State from all of our major universities and said, please assess the machines. These were all people involved in computer security. They came back and reported to me that of the five systems under review in Ohio, not a single one they would rate either excellent or very good in terms of both ease of use to the voter and security. That was a devastating finding to me.

Even though I voted for HAVA, I went back to the drawing boards and looked at what was going on in my State. My State at this point has received the \$41 million to buy machines, to buy technology which is probably not enough money to get an optical scanner and a paper trail, but it has not received the larger amount of money it should have received, \$117 million, to do the voter education and

all of the work that is necessary to bring up these new systems. So even though we voted for this law, just Ohio is \$66 million short in trying to bring these technologies up by next year. I wanted to place this on the RECORD.

Timing is vital. While communities are waiting to find out exactly how much money they may be getting, and some others do not want to move on acquiring equipment until they are sure of how much money they will be receiving, it is important to keep in mind:

While HAVA does state that new election machines should be in place for 2004; it is possible to get an extension until the first federal election held after January 1, 2006;

But in order to get this extension, an application must be submitted no later than January 1, 2004, at this point, to the General Services Administration, providing good cause for why the exemption should be granted;

GSA did send a letter to every governor and state election director when the initial Title I money was provided last year. However, they

have not yet sent out a reminder of the impending deadline.

So far, only Illinois has applied for the extension, and this request was approved last week.

Other reasons why the extension should be requested:

Gives more time to make sure that the right machines are acquired, if new machines are acquired;

Gives more time to test and verify the machines;

More importantly, it gives more time for the vote verification provisions of the Holt bill to be implemented in a fashion that will be the most efficient with respect to any new voting machine system.

And it gives more time for people to decide whether or not they actually want to buy new machines, because while HAVA provides for new machines, it does not mandate them if current voting systems can demonstrate that they meet the integrity requirements of HAVA.

HELP AMERICA VOTE ACT TIMELINE

Days/months after enactment	Date	Activity
45 days	December 13, 2002	Section 101: GSA establish grant program for payments to States to improve election administration.
45 days	December 13, 2003	Section 102: GSA establish grant program for payments to States to replace punch card or lever voting machines.
	January 1, 2003	States must be ready to accept materials from individuals who register by mail. Section 303(b).
90 days	January 27, 2003	Chief State election officials transmit notice to FEC Chair (and/or EAC) containing name of State election official and local election official selected to serve on Standards Board.
120 days	February 26, 2003	Appointment of 4 EAC Commissioners.
	March 31, 2003	State NVRA Reports for 2001–2002 due to FEC.
6 months	April 29, 2003	Last date on which States may submit certification to GSA for Section 101 payments.
6 months	April 29, 2003	Last date on which States may submit certification to GSA for Section 102 payments.
	June 30, 2003	2001–2002 NVRA report submitted to Congress.
	October 1, 2003	EAC adopts recommendations and voluntary guidance on Section 302 Provisional Voting Requirements.
	October 1, 2003	EAC adopts recommendations and voluntary guidance on Section 303 provisions on computerized statewide voter registration list requirements and mail registration requirements.
12 months	October 29, 2003	EAC submits Human Factors Report to the President and Congress. (Section 243).
12 months	October 29, 2003	EAC submits to Congress report on free absentee ballot postage. (Section 246).
	January 1, 2004	Deadline for States to qualify for waiver of computerized statewide voter registration databases.
	January 1, 2004	Last date for States applying for waiver of deadline for replacement of punchcard or lever voting machines using Section 102 payments.
	January 1, 2004	States not participating in the grant programs shall certify to the EAC that the State has established an administrative complaint procedures (Section 402), or has submitted a compliance plan to the U.S. Attorney General.
	January 1, 2004	Effective date for Section 302 provisional voting and voting information requirements.
	January 1, 2004	States and jurisdictions required to comply with Section 303 requirements pertaining to computerized statewide voter registration lists (unless qualified for a waiver) and 1st time voters who register by mail.
	January 1, 2004	EAC adopts voluntary guidance recommendations relating to Section 301 Voting Systems Standards requirements.
	January 1, 2004	Effective date of new Section 706 UOCAVA amendments prohibiting States from refusing to accept registration and absentee ballot applications on grounds of early submission.
	January 1, 2004	EAC submits first Annual Report to Congress.
18 months	March 29, 2004	EAC (in conjunction with FVAP) submits to the President and Congress a report and recommendations for facilitating military and overseas voting. (Section 242).
20 months	May 29, 2004	EAC submits to House and Senate a report on the issues and challenges presented by incorporating communication and internet technology into the election process. (Section 245).
	November 2, 2004	All punchcard and lever machines replaced in States accepting Section 102 payments, unless qualified for waiver.
	March 31, 2005	State NVRA Reports for 2003–2004 due to EAC.
	June 1, 2005	EAC submits report to President and Congress on voters who register by mail. (Section 244).
	June 1, 2005	EAC (in conjunction with SSA) reports to Congress on the feasibility and advisability of using SSN or other such information to establish registration or other election eligibility and ID requirements. (Section 244).
	June 30, 2005	2003–2004 NVRA report submitted to Congress.
	January 1, 2006	Each State and jurisdiction required to comply with the voting systems requirements in Section 301.
	January 1, 2006	Deadline for States to implement computerized Statewide voter registration database if qualified for waiver.
	January 1, 2006	All punchcard and lever machines replaced in States accepting Section 102 payments who qualified for a waiver of the original deadline.
	January 1, 2007	Voting systems purchased with Title II requirements payments must meet disability access standards in section 201.

[From the Washington Times, Oct. 29, 2003]
TOUCH-SCREEN VOTING READY, OFFICIALS SAY
(By Arlo Wagner)

Officials overseeing four of the five municipal elections Tuesday in Montgomery and Prince George's counties said yesterday they are confident that their electronic touch-screen voting machines are secure, despite lingering concerns that the machines are vulnerable to hackers and tampering.

"It's actually more secure than it was before," said Barry Smith, manager of election technology for Gaithersburg, one of the cities that used the Diebold AccuVote-TS in its elections two years ago.

Voters in Gaithersburg had an opportunity to try out the machines yesterday at three of the city's five polling places. Few voters, however, came out to the Asbury Methodist Village polling place, where, historically, the highest percentage of voters cast paper ballots.

Election officials said the low turnout could indicate that voters in that precinct were satisfied with the touch-screen machines last time.

"This is better than the old system," said Sarah Paxton, administrative secretary to Gaithersburg's city manager. "It may take a voter only 30 seconds to vote."

Registered voters must show identification to get a computerized card, which they then insert into the base of the machine. Once the card is in the machine, the names of all candidates are displayed on the screen.

Voters touch the names they are selecting. If they touch too many names, the screen will go blank and voters will have to start over. Once the preferred candidates are chosen, the machine will eject the card. The voters then must turn the card over to one of the judges who is overseeing the process.

Montgomery was one of three counties in Maryland to use the computerized voting machines in 2001. In July, a team of re-

searchers at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore found that the underlying computer code in the machines was vulnerable to outside parties.

After the Hopkins analysis, Gov. Robert L. Ehrlich Jr., a Republican, ordered San Diego-based Science Application International Corp. (SAIC) to review the system. Last month, SAIC reported that the system, "as implemented in policy, procedure and technology, is at high risk of compromise."

Mr. Ehrlich and state election officials decided the flaws identified by SAIC could be corrected before the presidential primary election in March. Maryland agreed to purchase \$55.6 million worth of machines just days before SAIC released its findings this summer. The machines are expected to be installed in 19 of Maryland's 23 counties.

Last week, several members of the Maryland's General Assembly asked for its own "independent" analysis that would, among

other things, examine issues about the electronic voting machines. That report is scheduled to be concluded before the General Assembly convenes in January.

Despite prior reviews of the system, officials in the four of the five cities that will be using the machines Tuesday say they had no problems with them last Election Day. Those cities holding elections are Takoma Park, Rockville, Gaithersburg, Greenbelt and College Park.

"We had no problems in the last election," said Catherine Waters, city clerk of Takoma Park, where voters next week will use the touch-screen machines to select a mayor and six city Council members.

Voters in Greenbelt will use a different computerized voting machine when they elect all five members to the City Council.

"I don't think anyone is batting an eye," Greenbelt City Clerk Kathleen Gallagher said.

However, voters in College Park will not use the touch-screen machines when they go to the polls to choose a mayor and four council members.

"We will be using paper ballots," which might be old-fashioned but are familiar to about 10,000 registered voters, said Yvette Allen, of the City Clerk's Office.

The municipal elections in Montgomery and Prince George's counties are dominated by unopposed incumbents.

In Rockville, voters will decide whether to elect a mayor and City Council every four years, instead of two. This will be the 59th city election in the city's 116-year history, said Neil Greenberger, the city's public information officer.

Voters in Gaithersburg will be electing three of the five council members.

Mr. HOLT. I thank the gentlewoman, and I think her insertions in the RECORD will be very useful to people. I thank her for her insightful comments.

I would make the point that even though HAVA does not require action immediately, the sooner we implement HAVA, the better. There are many people with physical disabilities who have been denied the privilege and the satisfaction of voting in person and in private. HAVA would correct that. But we must not let HAVA lead us to unverifiable voting. That is why I am proposing legislation that would, I think, correct this problem. It would require that all voting systems produce a paper record, an audit trail that is verified by the voter. In other words, each voter will see and verify a paper record of the vote. That will allow manual audits. It will mean that recounts actually mean something. This would be the vote of record. It would be kept safely with the election records for recounts.

My legislation would do some other things such as banning undisclosed software and would accelerate the date by which the provisions for people with disabilities would have to be met. But the fundamental point I wanted to make is that voting should not be an act of faith as my colleagues have said. It should be an act of record. It is also important to make the point that what I am talking about here is nonpartisan. It is preserving the sanctity of the ballot. This is not a Republican matter or a Democratic matter. It is fundamental to the American system.

I am sorry to say that the Internet is buzzing with conspiracy theories. In

other words, voters are afraid that something is afoot. It was reported in this week's Newsweek by Steven Levy that suspicions, as he says, run even higher when people learn that some of those in charge of the voting technology, the manufacturers of the voting machines, are themselves partisan. The CEO of a major company is a major fund-raiser for the Presidential reelection campaign. He recently said that he was "committed to helping Ohio deliver its electoral votes for the President next year." According to this article, he later clarified that he was not talking about rigging the machines.

Whew. That is actually Mr. Levy's expression. Whew.

By the proposal that I have, the legislative proposal I have, the printout would be at the voting machine at the time that the voter votes, available for the voter's inspection and verification. And it would go into a secure lockbox. If there is a need for a recount, the paper ballots would be tallied. It may not be a perfect system, but it is a way to assure the voters that the process is honest.

It is troubling that this is not getting as much attention here in this body as it should. An article appeared in the New Zealand Herald a few days ago. The article begins, "The possibility of flaws in the electoral process is not something that gets discussed much in the United States Congress. The attitude seems to be, we are the greatest democracy in the world, so the system must be fair."

That is not good enough. We are a great country because we constantly try to do better, because we constantly try to increase the franchise, increase accessibility to democracy, increase the reliability of the process. That is what we need to do. Yet from all over the country, I get e-mails. For instance, from Georgia: "If we can't verify our elections, then we can't verify our freedom."

From Idaho someone writes: "Those who cast the votes decide nothing. Those who count the votes decide everything."

From Michigan: "The act of voting is the most essential issue. This issue is the most essential issue our representatives will vote on and they should be judged accordingly."

From North Carolina: "A paper trail is the only reasonable solution to any computer-mediated transaction. As a corporate system security analyst, I find the electronic devices as they now stand without this verifiable backup simply irresponsible."

From North Dakota: "There is no confidence nor integrity without it."

From Ohio: "I work with computers every day. We need to check that what goes in is what comes out."

From Oregon: "Without this, I will no longer view this country as a democracy."

From Tennessee: "If there is no accountability in election, there is no

reason to vote and we descend into anarchy."

From Wisconsin: "If voters perceive," the key word here is perceive, "that their votes are being miscounted and are meaningless, they will simply stop voting."

That gives you some sense of the seriousness that voters assign to this issue. It is very important. This body should turn its attention to restoring the voters' trust in every way we can. One important way we can do that is by making sure that they have confidence in the process that makes this democracy work, the process of voting and then, of course, the process by which we fulfill the trust that they place in us.

As I have talked about this with people, I have run into a number of opinions. I was talking with an election official from another State who said, Well, we've had these electronic machines for several years now and we've had no problems. To which I said, How do you know?

□ 2215

He did not have an answer. We have to help him get that answer.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of every American's basic right to vote and to have that voted counted.

As it stands, voters have no way of knowing what is actually recorded, once they vote. H.R. 2239, the bill introduced by my colleague from New Jersey, would make certain the process of voting is not in any way a leap of faith.

This act would ensure our constituents see a record of verification for the votes they cast. When Americans go to the bank, they receive some manner of documented record, ensuring that their money is going where they intended. Likewise, Americans who use voting machines deserve a documented record confirming their vote was recorded correctly.

Nine percent of the U.S. population records their votes electronically. These numbers greatly vary from State to State. Twelve percent of Ohio votes are recorded electronically. Eighty percent of Kentucky voters use electronic ballots. Without an adequate confirmation method, mechanical misvotes could have a drastic impact on close elections. The problem would go unnoticed.

H.R. 2239 would also accelerate the deadline for compliance with voting systems standards from January 1, 2006 to the regularly scheduled November 2004 general Federal election. In order to guarantee accurately recorded votes for next year's election cycle, Congress must act now. We cannot put the basic rights of our constituents on hold.

The right to vote is a right every citizen of this country deserves. As Members of Congress, we all have an obligation to make sure all of our constituents' votes are counted through the most fair and accurate means available. Not just the blacks. Not just the whites. Not just the browns. Not just the yellows. Not just the Christians. Not just the Jews. Not just the Muslims. Not just the Atheists. Not just the Republicans. Not just the Democrats. The right to vote should not be reserved for just most of our constituents, but for all of our constituents.