

I have a more personal note. First of all, I am delighted to be able to salute those constituents that have stayed steady on the forefront, insisting that space exploration and human space shuttle is for everyone. But let me pay tribute to a neighbor and friend, Ron McNair, and I guess it was that time when that tragedy occurred that we began to understand that you do not take space exploration for granted, and that is why I am such a strong advocate for safety and for the dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to joining my colleagues and insisting on an added amount of dollars to ensure that we can do science in space; that the module gets completed, even though we are looking to the Italians; that seven people can be in space; and that, God forbid, we do not even think about an unsafe journey for the men and women who have offered themselves on behalf of this Nation.

This is a tribute to the many men and women and all those who have gone before us, and I am proud to stand here as a member of the Committee on Science and join the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON) to pay this tribute, but also to say to America, we have choices to make. We are fighting about education dollars, health dollars, but I believe we can invest in America's future by continuing our space exploration and making sure that the dollars are well spent. Less for tax cut, and more for investment. If we do that, we will get the kind of return that we need to have.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with Senate in getting more dollars to ensure that we have the kind of human space flight program, the unmanned program, the science program, the Earth program, and we begin to develop successful stories and successful ventures for this country and this world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ROHRABACHER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LANGEVIN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ENGEL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BENTSEN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

COMPREHENSIVE ELECTION REFORM LEGISLATION NEEDED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to open a discussion on election reform.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, as chair of the Democratic Caucus Special Committee on Election Reform, I stand before Congress today to urge this body to respond to the unrelenting public outcry for comprehensive election reform legislation.

Election reform is an issue that transcends all partisan politics. The right to vote is the very cornerstone of our democracy. Earlier this year I was honored to be appointed by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) House minority leader, to chair the U.S. House of Representatives Democratic Caucus Special Committee on Election Reform. I am very pleased to be joined on that committee by a prestigious group of representatives, including the ranking members of the Committee on House Administration and the Committee on the Judiciary. As a matter of fact, many of those on that committee may serve as speakers here today.

The goal of our committee is to ensure the integrity of the election process while increasing voter confidence and participation. While the Florida experience is still fresh in our mind, this committee has begun a thorough review of nationwide voting practices and election laws in an effort to restore the confidence of the American people.

We anticipate that our committee will propose legislation designed to serve our goals, identify key areas where uniform national standards may be appropriate, and make recommendations to Congress on the implementation of changes at the State and local levels.

On April 2, 2001, we held our first hearing in Philadelphia, the cradle of American democracy, and we learned firsthand from Philadelphia voters that when their names were not found on precinct rosters, they were forced to have to travel to police stations to see a judge to determine if they could vote.

Many voters confronted with this form of provisional voting ended up not voting at all, because they were intimi-

dated by the idea of having to go to a police station or because it was just a logistical nightmare.

At our second hearing in San Antonio, Texas on April 20, we heard testimony from registered voter Mrs. Carmen Martinez who was denied her right to vote in the November elections because her name had been erroneously purged from state voter polls. The Texas Secretary of State who also testified explained that Texas' practice of purging voter rolls resulted in 750,000 voters removed from the polls last year. In Texas names are purged from voter rolls as a result of confirmation notices mailed by county registrars which are returned as undeliverable or indicating a return of address.

However, Mrs. Martinez explained that she had never lived at any other address since the day she registered to vote.

On Saturday our committee will travel to Chicago, Illinois, where more ballots were discarded in the last election than in any other major city in the country. A hand-examination of the 123,000 discarded ballots found that the number one reason for the uncounted ballots was faulty ballot punches.

We recognize that in many States they are indeed in the process of approving reforms to their election systems. Most of these reforms relate to modernizing outdated voting equipment and machinery. The committee applauds these efforts to upgrade from punch card or lever voting systems to touch screen or optical scan systems, and we support these reforms.

□ 1500

But technological advances in voting equipment alone will not solve all of the problems of our electoral process. The committee intends to thoroughly examine issues relating to poll worker recruitment and training, national holidays or time off for voting, uniform voting standards, absentee voting, and standardized recount and vote certification procedures. Particular attention needs to be focused on issues relating to voter disenfranchisement, like the purging of voter rolls, voter identification requirements, provisional balloting, voter education, ballot design, sensitivity to poorly educated voters, and voters with disabilities, voting rights and voter intimidation issues. These issues have a disproportionate effect on voters in minority communities. We are monitoring civil rights lawsuits that have been filed in California, Florida, Illinois and St. Louis among others involving many of these issues.

Equally important is the disenfranchisement of overseas military personnel. Congress is uniquely situated to implement uniform standards to ensure that American men and women serving overseas have their voices heard in our elections. Similar reforms must be adopted for other U.S. citizens living abroad. Congress must indeed

take the lead role in restoring voter confidence in our election system and increasing voter participation.

Given the resources available to Congress and the studies being developed by other organizations and commissions, Congress is in the best position to identify key areas where uniform, national standards may very well be appropriate. We need to pass legislation and propose recommendations for changes at the State and local levels to ensure that every vote is indeed counted. As chair of this committee, I will do everything in my power to see that we accomplish these goals on behalf of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I know that just as I and the Members who serve on this committee are concerned about voter reform, we have members in the Senate who are very much concerned and they too are working, holding hearings and putting together legislation. Just this morning, the Congressional Black Caucus met with many members of the United States Senate. At that meeting, we heard from Senator DODD about legislation that he is proposing. We also heard more about the legislation that is being proposed by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS). And we know that we have many other Members, even some of the Members who serve on our special committee, such as the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) and also the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), all who have introduced legislation. So we have many pieces of legislation that are being introduced. I think our committee will be able to examine this legislation and we will be able to give input and recommendation to those who will end up being the final persons who will present legislation, both in this body and in the other body, to come up with legislation that can indeed carry us into election reform.

We are concerned, however. There is no money in the budget for election reform. And we are surprised about that. We had talked at length to representatives of this administration about election reform and we had been told that it was important to the President and that it was important to even the Republican Conference. But we have not been able to get any commitments for the resources that are necessary to help some of these jurisdictions who have little or no money to deal with just the simple problems of replacing punch card systems and getting rid of machines that do not work.

We will continue to try to encourage the President and Members on the other side of the aisle to get involved in this issue, to help us get the resources that we need in order to make reform a reality.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) to share with us the important work that she is doing on provisional balloting in the election process.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I thank the gentlewoman from California not only for yielding but for her steadfast leadership on this very important issue of election reform. As chairperson of the Democratic Caucus Special Committee on Election Reform, she is working to ensure that citizens across the Nation are aware of the serious effort that is going on to reform our system and guaranteeing that in the future, no eligible voter will ever be turned away again, shut out or discriminated against on election day.

This Saturday, the committee will hold its next hearing in Chicago. Hundreds of voters will have the opportunity to tell us their experiences about how we can improve the system. Chicago, a large part of which I have in my district, had the most error-ridden Presidential election last fall of any major U.S. city, with 123,000 uncounted ballots in Cook County.

That is why the work of this committee is so important. We can learn from voters across the country and from local election officials and experts how we can reform our election system. What the 2000 election has taught us is that many problems exist and that without serious Federal legislative steps, we are destined for another Florida fiasco with the election decided by the judicial branch and not the electorate.

Florida could have happened anywhere. As it turns out, it certainly could have happened in Chicago given all the problems that we had. On election day around the country, voters were turned away from the polling place. They were unfairly targeted. They were not allowed to fully exercise their constitutional right during the election.

This past election taught us a very important lesson. Voters were penalized for no fault of their own. That is why I believe, as I believe the gentlewoman does, that Congress can play a role in reforming current law. One of the ways that it can do it is with provisional voting legislation. It is important that one standard exist nationwide that would guarantee that no registered voter is turned away at the polls.

When we talk about national involvement in elections, which is largely a matter of local jurisdictions, we are not talking about muddling in their business. What we are talking about is setting standards that will guarantee the right of every citizen and the details left to the local jurisdiction. But this provisional voting issue is one where we can play a role in setting the standard. Passing legislation like, for example, my Provisional Voting Rights Act of 2001, H.R. 1004, registered voters can feel confident if their name does not appear on the registration list, they will be permitted to vote. They would not have to go, as they do in some places, we heard in Philadelphia, to a police station, or leaving the polling place in order to get their provisional ballot.

During the committee's hearing in Philadelphia, we heard testimony from Juan Ramos, founder of the Delaware Valley Voter Registration Education Project and Petricio Morales, an ordinary voter, who testified that voters had to travel to the police station to see a judge to determine whether they are eligible to vote. Voters then had to travel all the way back to the polling place to cast their vote. Many voters who are confronted with that process either decide not to vote because they feel intimidated or because of time constraints or just plain inconvenience.

In Cook County, if your name does not appear in the right place, then you are just simply prohibited from voting altogether. You can vote by affidavit under certain limited conditions but there are many instances where even though you may be a registered voter, you cannot vote on election day.

We have to change that. Voters should be given a provisional ballot after affirming their right before an election official right there at the polling place. They can vote immediately and feel confident that if it is certified that day that they are eligible, that that vote will count. If our goal is to ensure that more voter participation occurs, we should take steps to ensure that this is achieved. And reforming provisional voting is a step in that direction.

Actually in the legislation that I have, if they cannot show that this person is not eligible to vote, then the person would be able to vote, exercising their right as a citizen of the United States. I am certain that we will hear more during our committee's hearings in Chicago on Saturday and across the country as the committee continues to highlight the importance of election reform in subsequent hearings. I look forward to that. I once again congratulate my colleague from California on a job well done.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely thank the gentlewoman from Chicago for all of the work that she has done on election reform. She has been at every meeting. She has traveled with us both to Texas and to Pennsylvania and, of course, she is hosting us in Chicago this weekend. She is giving priority time to this issue. And it is because of the kind of work that she is doing, we are going to be able to help set some standards on issues such as provisional balloting.

Now it is my great pleasure to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina to deal with the bill and some issues that he has been working with on election reform. I thank him for all of the time and attention that he has given to us as we have tried to put together this committee and gather the information that we need to make the recommendations to this House.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank my colleague for yielding. I want to underscore what others have

said, that the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) has done a wonderful job in pulling this committee together and in taking us all over the country to examine voting practices and possible reforms in various communities. I think we are going to have some very significant results in a relatively short period of time.

Everyone in the country, of course, knows about the travesty that occurred in Florida last fall. But what we have learned is that unfortunately, it is not that unusual for people to have their votes not counted accurately, to find that somehow their name has mysteriously dropped off the rolls when they go to vote on election day. There is a range of problems and challenges that we need to deal with to make our democracy work as it needs to work. Certainly the right to vote and to have your vote counted is fundamental to democracy.

My particular focus today is going to be on voting equipment, because we know that we need modern equipment to have votes cast accurately and counted accurately and unfortunately there is a great disparity in this country in the kind of equipment that people are using and the kind of equipment that local communities have access to. All too often, there is a correlation between the worst, worn-out, inaccurate equipment and the economic level of that neighborhood and that precinct and that community.

That simply is unacceptable. It is unacceptable for any community to have worn-out, inaccurate equipment but particularly for it to be concentrated in lower-income areas, minority areas, that is just simply unacceptable. We should not stand for it for another election. Before the 2002 election occurs, we must move on this problem.

It is sort of like the situation we face when we find a neighborhood built on top of a toxic waste dump. How do we respond? We respond to that emergency by buying out those homes to protect the people who live there. When a flood wipes out a community like happened in eastern North Carolina not too long ago, we respond by buying out property to protect the residents and help them find safe places to live.

□ 1515

Well, I think error-prone voting equipment is no less an emergency. It is an emergency that threatens our democracy, and we need an immediate response. And it is going to take some money. It is going to take some money to upgrade voting technology from error-prone punch-card systems to reliable machines. But we cannot afford not to do anything, and here too I think a buyout is warranted, a buyout of these machines, so that new, accurate machines can be in place by the 2002 election.

Just look at what error-prone voting machinery does to our democracy. It is impossible to say every vote counts, when a study done by Caltech and MIT

revealed that the spoilage rate for punch cards from 1988 to 2000 was 2.9 percent, or as many as 986,000 votes in the year 2000 alone.

In Florida last year, the spoilage rate for punch cards was 3.9 percent. In Fulton County, Georgia, the punch-card spoilage rate reached 6.25 percent. In Cook County, Illinois, it was 5 percent during the last election. That amounts to 120,000 ballots.

Now, we have seen some encouraging efforts in cities and counties and States to get rid of this error-prone equipment. In 1996, the City of Detroit used punch-card machines and 3.1 percent of its ballots were spoiled. In 2000, after the city moved to an optical scan system, which warns voters of errors and allows them to correct mistakes, the rate fell to 1.1 percent.

In the States, Georgia recently passed legislation requiring uniform election equipment throughout the State by 2004, and the State is going to conduct a pilot project to test electronic touch screen voting equipment in the 2001 municipal elections.

Maryland passed legislation to require the State Board of Elections to select and certify a new voting system to be used by all counties in the State. And, as we have recently heard, in Florida, the legislature passed sweeping election reform, including \$24 million for new voting systems. Florida has banned punch-card machines, thank goodness, and it requires counties now to use electronic or precinct-based optical scan equipment in the 2002 elections.

Perhaps I ought to point out in discussing the possible avenues for reform that we are not necessarily finding that high-tech is always better. In fact, some of the answers to our problems might be described as low-tech.

For example, these precinct-based optical scan machines which have been turned to in so many areas are not as complex or advanced or certainly as expensive as touch screen machines or proposed Internet voting. But the fundamental question is not how fancy or how expensive or how complicated the machinery is, but rather does it work? Does it enable you to cast your vote in a straightforward way, and does it count that vote accurately? There may be many different technologies that lend themselves to our reform efforts.

The U.S. election system comprises 200,000 polling places, 7,000 jurisdictions, 1.4 million poll workers and 700,000 voting machines, so it is not a simple system and there are not simple solutions. But Congress needs to be an active and constructive partner if we are going to have a successful and meaningful election reform, and there is no better time to act than now.

There are several proposals in the Congress to help States and counties and cities get the technology they need to run accurate elections. A bill I introduced with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN)

would make grants available to any jurisdiction that used a punch-card voting system in the last election. We want to see them get new equipment in place by 2002, and we are going to push for Federal funding to make that buyout happen, to get those inaccurate, worn-out machines off line and bring on more accurate systems.

I am disappointed that the President and our Republican friends have failed to include one dollar for election reform in their budget, but that must not stop us. This Congress must meet the challenge of restoring faith in our democracy.

I thank my colleague from California for her leadership in making this happen, and I pledge my continued support, my continued work, to make meaningful election reform a front-burner item before even the first session of this Congress goes home.

Ms. WATERS. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for all of the time and attention he has given to the efforts of this committee. It is because of his diligent work and his efforts that we are going to be successful in helping to reform the election systems of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ).

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California and join everyone that preceded me in praise of her efforts and the leadership that she has demonstrated in making sure that this committee meets its charge.

Mr. Speaker, if one thinks in terms of the greatest and most precious right that any American citizen would have, and that is the right to vote, it is the great equalizer. One vote counts just as much as any other. The vote of the President of the United States is no more important and is given no more weight than the vote of someone who is 18 years old and happens to be a senior in high school and casting their vote for the first time. It empowers us. It empowers the people of the greatest democracy known in all of history, and therein lies our problem, and that is the exercise of that right.

Now, we all know that we have laws at the State and Federal level that protect the right to vote. It guarantees the right to vote. We have the Constitution of the United States, the Supreme Court of the land, that, again, will guarantee us the right to vote. But it is only guaranteeing the right to vote.

What thwarts, what frustrates, what impedes the citizen's right to vote, regardless of the constitutional guarantee or the laws that we have on the books? Well, believe it or not, it is something as simple as a machine that malfunctions, something a little more complicated by not keeping an accurate voter list.

In the past though, and this is so important, and I think we are forgetting the lessons that history should have taught us, when I was growing up in

the State of Texas the greatest evil to the right to vote was the poll tax. It kept people from being able to exercise that precious right. The poll tax at one time was about \$1. It went up to about \$2. My father, who served in this Chamber for 37 years, the first bill he introduced upon being sworn in was to abolish the poll tax, and eventually it was.

But then there was something else, literacy tests. Anything that could keep the citizens of the United States from exercising their right to vote.

Well, we have made great progress. We do not have literacy tests any more, we do not have the poll tax any more. But what comes in its place today? Either through intention or through neglect, other things are now posing as great a risk to the disenfranchisement of the citizens as in the past, where once, because of gender or color, people were denied the right to vote, and once, because they did not have the amount of dollars to pay for the poll tax or could not pass some made up literacy test, were denied the right to vote. That was a travesty, as I said, and we corrected it.

But we are back there. That is the tragedy of what was demonstrated in Florida, is that we may still be there. It is more subtle. Like I said, maybe it is by some intentional act, or it could be simply by negligence.

What do I mean by that? Well, today we have voting equipment that simply does not work. I mean, it simply does not work. It does not do its intended job.

We have inaccurate voter lists, so that when people go to vote, they are not on the list and they are denied the right to vote, even though they truly are registered. Because of some mistake, lack of funds, technology, they are just not on the list.

Confusing ballot design. There are many. I will tell you right now, if you look at certain ballots, you will be confused. I know that when I go to vote, I assume it is going to be somewhat of a simple ballot. I hate to admit, but in a recent City Council election in San Antonio, when I went to vote earlier, I looked at that thing and I was too embarrassed to ask for instructions. A lot of people feel that way. I think I was more embarrassed than the average citizen, because I am a Member of Congress. But the point is, if I felt somewhat intimidated, if I was confused, think of the average citizen going to the polling place.

In Texas, we do have provisional ballots in voting. If your name is not on the list, you might be able to swear, if you have an educated, trained, skilled poll worker that knows the law. However, that is denied many voters, because we do not have trained and educated poll workers. They are not paid enough, they are not trained, they are not educated in the election law, that which they are there to administer.

It sounds outrageous, but there is no one right now that can hear my voice, no matter where you live, that is not

experiencing this problem. You just do not know about it. You have not looked into it.

That is what this committee is doing. We are going throughout the United States and holding hearings in different locations, Philadelphia, San Antonio; it will be Chicago next. And what are we learning? We are learning quite a bit.

I will tell you what I learned in San Antonio, my own backyard. We have the problems as Florida. We have overvotes. We never knew that they were invalidating individuals' votes until we looked at it in the context of the Florida experience. And then I have got my election officials saying, well, Congressman, this is nothing new. We always have these votes. We just toss them out. They do not count.

See, you have to ask yourself, why do we have these? It might be ballot design or the equipment itself, improper instruction, the lack of voter education. Again, the polling worker in San Antonio, I found out in a city where you have more than 60 percent Hispanic population that we did not have bilingual poll workers in many of those parts of the community, where it is not 60 percent Hispanic, it is 85 and 90 percent Hispanic. So it is my own backyard. And I am willing to admit to it, that out of ignorance, I never got involved. Out of ignorance, I never did anything.

The tragedy of Florida is not what happened in Florida. In and of itself, it is a tragedy. The real tragedy is if we do not learn a lesson and do something.

So this committee is going to do something. We are going to identify the problems. We are going to make recommendations. We will come up with legislation that will address many of these problems.

But do not get us wrong. Part of our job is to be a clearinghouse for not just the problems, but for the ideas and the solutions and the remedies. And we will look to the States and the local authorities to come up with their own solutions, those that custom fit their particular problem. We want to give the States and the localities that opportunity, because that is what we do here in Congress.

We do not want a Federal fix for every problem. However, if action is not taken that addresses the inequities and the injustices of people not being able to vote, then it is our duty, as Federal officials, to step in and not only give direction, but basically do it on our own.

I do not think it will come to that. I think we will make certain suggestions. Many States and localities are already incorporating and enacting laws. If there is a shortcoming, we will say, how can we help?

You have already heard one of my colleagues. We have legislation, it has already been introduced, about assisting localities in the purchase of the latest technology, which is really important. But they will make the deci-

sion on what best suits their situation. But we are there to help.

It is so important. I guess there is no way to explain it. How can we guarantee the right to vote to the citizen? How can we teach the children in our classrooms how great our country is, and then we say, voter participation is decreasing. Get out there and vote. Every year, every election, I am out there with some sort of public service announcement, begging my constituents to please get out there, to register and vote.

Now they are going to take me up on that. They go and attempt to exercise that right, and they are not able to. Therein lies the real problem. I do not think the problem is that we do not have enough laws guaranteeing the right, we just do not have the mechanism to translate the right into reality, and that is our charge.

Madam Chairman, I think I am going to end where I started. I am going to thank you for the leadership you provided us. It is a great honor to serve on this committee, and I think many, many people are going to be quite impressed with the end product.

We have heard that this is not an issue that is way at the top of the list as far as the American public or the United States Congress is concerned, and that is wrong, because then what we have done is we have compounded the tragedy of Florida. We did not learn a lesson, we did not make a situation better, we did not cure a problem.

□ 1530

Should we fail to do that, I think we have failed in our duty and responsibility; but more importantly, we have failed the American people. They have a right to vote, but they also have a right to make sure that that vote is counted. What good is a right if one cannot exercise it.

Again, I thank the gentlewoman very much.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Texas, not only for his participation here today, but for his participation on this very special committee. He has been at every meeting, and I want my colleagues to know that he rolled out the red carpet for us in San Antonio where we had an excellent hearing and we learned an awful lot about purging and had testimony from Mrs. Carmen Martinez, who told us about what happened to her there.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Maryland as much time as he may consume. While the gentleman is coming to the microphone, I would like to say that we are so happy to have him on this committee. He has contributed tremendously to our work already; not only has he been involved with us as we have traveled, but he has been to all of the meetings that we hold every Tuesday, and he has been working very hard, trying to bridge the gap between this side of the aisle and that side of

the aisle, to come up with legislation that will move us forward in reform. I thank the gentleman so very much for all that he has done.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments. I want to also thank her for the extraordinary efforts that she is making to ensure that not only will in America every citizen have the right to vote and be welcomed and encouraged in exercising that right, but will also have his vote counted correctly.

When the minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), was discussing who should chair a committee that would look at election reforms, the problems that were brought to light in the last election, we had some discussions. He suggested the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), and the reason he did so is because he knew and I knew and her colleagues knew that the gentlewoman is one of the strongest, most courageous voices that we have on this floor, a voice much like the voice of the gentleman from Texas's father who, in his time, was a giant in speaking out for those who were disenfranchised by operation of law. No less should we speak out for those who might be disenfranchised by either negligence or the misoperation of technology.

So I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership, for her hard work on this effort; and I am confident that we are going to pass legislation in this Congress. This is the civil rights issue of the 107th Congress. There is no more basic right in democracy than the right to vote. When we do pass legislation, it will be largely attributable to her hard work and efforts in making sure that everybody in the Nation is focused on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak for a few minutes on one element that is key to reform: better voting technologies, the nuts and bolts of the election infrastructure. Now, as I begin this, I want to make it again clear that the technology issue comes in only after we have ensured and facilitated a voter getting to the technology. If the voter never gets to the technology, it is irrelevant.

So the most important thing we need to make sure of is that every voter is able to register; that they have their registration accurately recorded; that it is transmitted accurately to a polling place; that the election officials receive the voter and accurately check to make sure that voter is registered; and that there is, if there is a failure to communicate from the recipient of the registration and the polling place, a way in which a provisional ballot can be cast, so that that voter is not turned away, is not told no, your democracy is not open to you today, not because of your failure, but because we failed to transmit information properly. So what we are going to do is allow you to vote and then we will take a day or two to make sure that you, as you have said, were registered to vote and a legal voter.

None of us on this floor wants to facilitate voting by people who are not eligible to vote. But equally, I hope, there is nobody on this floor who wants to prevent an eligible voter from casting a vote. We found in Florida that people who got to the polls voted, thought they had voted correctly, left, and found that, lo and behold, their votes were not counted. We further found that this was not a Florida problem. It was Florida that we focused on, it was Florida that we learned from, but we quickly were informed by others around the country that it was not a Florida problem.

It was a problem in jurisdictions north, east, south and west, in Maryland, in California, in Texas, and New Jersey, the four jurisdictions represented on the floor right now. So we focused on the fact that we need to make sure that that voter, when they exercise their franchise, has it counted and has it counted accurately. Better voting technology is the nuts and bolts of election infrastructure.

When I say nuts and bolts, I mean that quite literally. Over the past 2 days, the Committee on House Administration, of which I am the ranking Democratic member, has learned from the manufacturers that actually build the sophisticated, durable equipment that Americans use to exercise their right of franchise, equipment used not only by Americans, by the way, but voters all over the world, many of whom have struggled to attain the right to vote and will retain it only if their nations' democracies are conducted honestly. While we have a long history and are not at risk, we are at risk of retaining the confidence of our people that their votes will be accurately counted when their voices are raised to participate in democracy.

For that reason, it is not an exaggeration, I think, to say that the voting machine manufacturers build the tools that make democracies all over the world live up to their names. They produce what I will call the "voting veins of democracy." And how well those veins carry votes forward to an accurate count can be the difference between a democracy whose heart pumps strongly and faithfully and a system that does not enjoy the confidence of its citizens.

Over the past 2 days, 13 vendors have displayed the newest technology available in the voting machine industry in the Committee on House Administration room. Members of Congress, their staffs, the media, and the general public have had the opportunity to test the machines and to ask questions. I saw the full range of what the voting technology industry is developing, including Optiscan equipment and Direct Read Equipment, so-called DRE, computer touch-screen equipment. I also learned and other Members and staff learned about sophisticated software and hardware to ensure that voting is accessible to all Americans, and "all" needs to be underlined, that votes are

counted accurately and completely, and that voters have a chance to correct mismarked ballots before they are cast.

That is so critically important, Madam Speaker, as the gentlewoman well knows. What we have found is a system that counts at the precinct level is much more accurate than a system that counts at a central location after the voter has left, where there is no opportunity to tell the voter, you forgot to vote, you over-voted, you made a mistake, do you want to try to correct your ballot. People make mistakes, but we should not subject them to the vagaries of the possibility of making a mistake when we have technology that can say to them, either you did not vote for President, do you want to; you do not have to, we are not forcing you to, but do you want to? Did you forget this? Or, hey, you voted for two people for President and that will not be counted. Do you want to correct it? Give them that opportunity so they can ensure the fact that they have exercised their franchise correctly.

We also learned about sophisticated software and hardware devices to ensure that voting is accessible to those with disabilities, to those who are even quadriplegic and cannot use hands or feet, to those who are blind, to those who have other impairments. We can fully make accessible the voting system to them and provide for the secrecy of their ballot as well. That technology is available. We need to pursue it.

What I did not see on display, I am happy to say, is the latest in punch card technology. Why? Because almost everybody has concluded that punch cards have seen their day and ought to be on their way. The fact of the matter is, Florida, with only two dissenting votes, has mandated the abolition of the use of punch cards in their State. Only two dissenting votes, unanimous in the Senate and two in the House. They came up with money, and the President's brother, Governor Jeb Bush, signed the bill and they are proceeding to do that. I am hopeful that President Bush will follow the lead of his brother, Governor Bush, and help us take that same path.

Any industry operating at the cutting edge can teach us a lot about the future of technology. What I have learned from the voting technology industry in the past 2 days is that there is no future for that punch card. Inventors may yet devise a better mouse-trap. What they will not devise, however, is a better punch card.

The punch card will soon be obsolete. I look forward to the day when it will be on display downtown in the Smithsonian and not in the voting precinct. We may talk about those days between November 8 and December 12 when we were mesmerized by the 537 votes, or the 219 votes, or the five votes that would make a difference in counting these punch cards, and whether or not

they would make a difference in Florida's electoral votes. We are beyond that, and it is not the purpose of anybody on this floor to look back. It is, however, to learn from that history and not see it repeated.

I have also learned that taking advantage of the latest, most reliable and accessible technology represented in that room, in the Committee on House Administration room, that voting technology will not be cheap. Now, relatively speaking, in my opinion, it will not be extraordinarily expensive either, and it is worth the price. But the average DRE machine runs about \$4,500. That is a touch-screen machine or some other computer technology. The average Optiscan technology where one fills out the ballot as if one is taking a test, and take a number 2 pencil or something else and connect the dots, or connect the line, and then put it into the counting machine and have it scanned optically, from which it gets its name. If you have not voted correctly, if you have overvoted, it simply kicks it out, and says, you have made a mistake, you get it back and you can correct it. But that costs about \$5,000 to \$6,000.

While communities should be expected to help pay for much of the cost of these machines, we in Congress have an obligation to foot the bill. For over 200 years, States and localities have been conducting elections, and during those 200-plus years, they have had Federal officials running on their ballots, and they have paid the full price. We, in effect, have gotten a free lunch. It is appropriate that we at the Federal level, as State and local governments do, participate in partnership in ensuring the accurate, accessible elections of our officials. After all, we in Congress are elected on the machines that are now in use, including the punch card devices that were used in 72,000 of the 200,000 voting precincts last year.

We in Congress will be elected on the new machines that start entering service in the months ahead, I hope by 2002. It is therefore, Madam Speaker, appropriate that we help with guidelines and encouragement to local subdivisions to run these elections as best they possibly can, in this, probably the most technologically proficient Nation on the face of the Earth. Surely, surely, we can, we must. It is our sacred obligation to ensure that this Nation, a beacon of democracy for all the world, is as good a democracy as the world thinks it is and as we know it to be.

□ 1545

I might say, I also look forward to joining the gentlewoman on Saturday when we go to Chicago where we will hear from voters and those who administer elections as to how best we can make the system work.

I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership.

Ms. WATERS. I thank the gentleman from Maryland so very much for all of the work that he has put into this issue

of election reform. I thank him for the attention he has paid to the committee, and I thank him for the work that he is doing to come up with legislation dealing with this technology.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Maryland to join me as we close out in a colloquy just reinforcing how important this issue is.

I would just like to say to the gentleman from Texas, I was listening to him as he talked about the work of his father, a man that I loved dearly and paid a lot of attention to, and hope to follow in his footsteps, by the way.

I thought about the work that I have done here, the issues I have been involved in: women's issues, women's health issues, criminal justice issues, AIDS issues, foreign affairs issues, et cetera. But I think that this work that we are doing on election reform may be the most important work that I will do in my entire career here in the Congress of the United States.

Do Members feel that this work holds that kind of priority, I ask the gentleman?

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I think our colleague, the gentleman from Maryland, said it, that it really is almost a sacred duty because it is a sacred trust. Nothing rises to the level of the importance of this issue.

People sometimes think we are given to hyperbole and exaggeration, but we really are talking about the fundamentals of a democracy, the absolute right of the public to be masters of their own destiny. It is the right to vote.

Again, this is not a Republican or a Democratic issue. That is the beauty of it, too. It transcends party lines, philosophies, everything; station in left. This is basically the common thread, more or less, that our citizenry really holds in common.

So I agree with the gentlewoman, I do not think there is going to be anything more important that I will ever work on. I am the lucky one. I have only been here 3 years. I am lucky to have this opportunity.

But truly in relation to all the wonderful leaders who have preceded us, and we are thinking about the Civil Rights Act and so on, what we are talking about is really giving life to those laws, and life and meaning to the Constitution. So we are privileged, but by the same token, I think it is a tremendous responsibility. We cannot fail.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, as I work with the committee members and as I listen to all that has been said here today, and as I stand here as an African American woman, and to my right I have a gentleman representing Texas of Hispanic descent, and I have here on my left the gentleman from Maryland, a Caucasian gentleman, we are really the rainbow of America on this issue.

I think that all Americans, no matter where we are in this country, no matter what our backgrounds are, all Americans care about this cornerstone of democracy.

Would the gentleman say this is a very central issue?

Mr. HOYER. I think the gentlewoman is absolutely right. The polls reflect that. The polls reflect overwhelmingly that Americans expect us to fix the problem of which they were made aware last November and December.

They were shocked to learn that many absentee ballots and overseas ballots were never counted in the course of running the elections. It was just expected by election officials if they were not going to make a difference, they would not be counted. I was chagrined. I may not have been shocked, but I was certainly chagrined to hear that.

I am a white male, who from the very start of this nation everybody presumed would vote. Margaret Brent was the first woman lawyer. She came from Maryland. She was on the Governor's Council. Governor Calvert died, and she asked for a vote. She was denied that vote.

It is incredible to me that we have had to amend the Constitution on a number of occasions in this connection. Thomas Jefferson intoned words that all of us recite, that all men, presumably but not necessarily meaning women as well, were endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, and among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Clearly it was the concept of so many of us that that meant all of us, but clearly, it did not mean all of us. It was not until a great civil war and the Thirteenth Amendment that we ensured that, at least legally, African Americans could not be discriminated against.

But we know as a result of poll taxes and literacy tests and the imposition of devices to intimidate people from registering and coming to vote that that was honored more in the breach than it was in the adherence.

We know that immigrants, nonwhite Caucasian Americans, had difficulty, for which the father of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) was a giant in saying, that is not right.

We did not add women, and an African American woman, or African Americans, men at least, could vote before women could vote. It was incredible that in the enlightened democracy of America in 1914 and 1918 women could not vote. We had to pass a constitutional amendment which said that we are not going to discriminate on the basis of gender.

It was not until 1965, as the gentlewoman knows, when we passed the Voting Rights Act that we said, we cannot have poll taxes, we cannot have literacy taxes, we cannot preclude, and the Federal government is going to step in and ensure that every American has access to the polling place? Why? Because it is central.

Then we had another constitutional amendment and said that if one is old enough to go overseas and fight to defend democracy, one is old enough to

vote at 18. We amended the Constitution again. So this has been an ongoing process of ensuring that our democracy is participated in by every citizen, not just a select few.

This effort is about that objective. Again, I think the gentilewoman is correct, it is a critically important objective.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlemen for participating with me today. They have both stated so clearly and in so many ways that something is wrong with the system and we perhaps fell asleep at the wheel, and we allowed the infrastructure to kind of fall apart.

Many of us thought with the 1965 Voting Rights Act that we had gotten rid of all of the problems. Little did we know that we would reach a time when we could not recruit polling place workers. Little did we know that we would have a system that did not train them so they would know what to do when a provisional ballot was needed. Little did we ever dream that we would find ourselves at a time when there is a polling place with almost 100 percent Latino voters and no one to do translation, or to make sure that they have access to that vote and to that ballot.

I want Members to know how proud I am to serve here in the Congress of the United States, and to serve with Members who care so much that they make this their priority work.

I want Members to know how proud I am to be able to do the kind of work my ancestors would certainly have me do, and I am so proud that I have been given this opportunity, and that the people who have joined with me appointed to this committee are working very hard.

Yes, we have been to Texas, we have been to Pennsylvania, and we are on our way to Chicago, a place that really does need us. It has needed us for a long time. We are on our way there to find out what we can do to strengthen the system. But we will be going to many other places.

Let me conclude by saying, as a Californian, a suit has been filed in California by the ACLU because, as sophisticated as we are supposed to be, guess what, we rank right up there with some of the other States like Illinois where votes are thrown out, not counted, because of overvoting and other problems in the system.

So hopefully both Members will be able to join me in California as we take a look at this suit and see what we can do.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, I am committed to building on the success of growing Latino voter turnout by working with my colleagues to achieve meaningful election reform before the 2002 elections.

The 2000 presidential election has brought long overdue attention to the need to overhaul our country's election procedures and provide resources that will ensure we have accurate elections. Central to these efforts must be the protection of each citizen's ability to freely exercise his or her right to vote.

Throughout our nation's history, expansion of the right to vote has been a struggle, and it is a struggle that continues to this day. The glare of media coverage, caused by the closest presidential election of our time, exposed voting irregularities that have long been ignored all across the country, not just in Florida.

Numerous legislative proposals have been introduced in this Congress to address election reform, and I believe it is encouraging to see that so many members are making this a priority. While there are about a dozen different bills, they also share many similarities. It is clear that based on the proposals we have seen so far, we need to move toward establishing a new elections body that will be charged with distributing grants to local election authorities for modernizing voting procedures and providing incentives to voting machine manufacturers to improve their equipment and invest in research and development.

In order to gain useful knowledge necessary for the effective modernization of our voting system, a study will need to be conducted of voting irregularities in the 2000 election and of flaws in our voting system in general.

As we chart our way through these various reforms, which coincide with another upcoming round of redistricting, the significance of minority representation is going to be greater than ever. Where necessary, we must be prepared to reaffirm support for, and strengthen, the provisions of the Voting Rights Act and National Voter Registration Act that protect minority representation and bilingual elections services.

The problems facing the integrity of our elections fall into two broad categories: (1) logistical challenges, and (2) barriers to voter turnout.

There are three main logistical problems prevalent in the process of running elections. First, local election boards are typically underfunded. As a result, counties are unable to replace antiquated voting machines. The punch-card ballots made infamous by the Florida recount are used by about one third of voters. Replacing them all with a more reliable system will be a costly, though certainly worthwhile investment.

Second, there is a shortage of adequately trained staff to respond in a timely and professional manner to voters' questions about absentee voting, their registration status, polling place locations and other concerns. On election day itself, many polling places open late, are not open long enough or lack polling place workers who are adequately trained, further causing delays, confusion and the disenfranchisement of voters. In particular, there is a lack of bilingual staff who are able to help voters who face a language barrier at the polls.

Third, polling place access is an extremely important logistical issue, and is not always directly related to funding. Every polling place should be easily accessible and in safe, familiar locations that are easy for residents to find.

The most troubling obstacle to fair elections is voter suppression, which is aimed almost exclusively at minorities. Unfortunately, such tactics are prevalent across the country and not only targeted against African-American voters. The practice of placing so-called security guards, or volunteers in clothing that resemble uniforms, at polling places has been used to intimidate Latino voters in past elections. The use of misleading radio broadcasts

or other means to confuse minority voters about their polling place location is another tactic employed to keep down minority turnout. First-time voters, such as newly naturalized citizens, many of whom are Latino, are particularly susceptible to confusion about the voting process, especially because relatively less, if any, election information is provided in Spanish.

In response, state and county governments must be spurred to pro-actively prevent voter suppression in heavily minority precincts. To ensure smoother elections, there needs to be greater investment and attention in such precincts to ensure appropriate staffing levels and training, equipment, polling place site selection, and education campaigns.

We will need to consider ways of enhancing the enforcement of existing laws that punish voter intimidation and implement new or stronger penalties where necessary. We should also consider expanding the scope of such efforts to include more passive forms of voter suppression, such as the withholding of assistance and information to voters might prevent them from voting. For example, there have been many accounts of polling place workers refusing to allow voters the right to a provisional ballot, a right that was expanded under the 1993 National Voter Registration Act.

A final obstacle to voter turnout relates to the maintenance of voter registration rolls, which must be considerably improved. Latino voters have experienced problems with getting on the rolls in the first place and then later being purged from them. The problem with getting on the rolls is related to problems with voter registration. Voter registration forms have been rejected for arbitrary reasons, such as being filled out with the wrong color ink, and during the most recent election, there were reports from Florida of Latinos who had registered but whose names did not appear on the rolls and were therefore barred from voting.

The other side of the voter roll problem is when legitimate names are purged. In a number of states, voters are purged from the voter rolls if they do not vote in every presidential election or a set number of elections within a certain amount of time. Requiring voters to re-register if they happen to miss an election, or else risk being ineligible to vote in a subsequent election, is just another barrier to voting.

I will be working with my colleagues in the Congressional Hispanic Caucus to press for increased funding of election boards; promote voter participation through national legislative and educational efforts; and monitor existing voter protections, especially the 1975 and 1992 amendments to the Voting Rights Act which protect language minority groups and require bilingual services.

Voting is a hard-won right that should not be a struggle for minorities in every election. In addition to empowering minority citizens about their rights as voters, we can also make considerable progress toward improving the way we run and monitor elections, making them as easy and convenient for minority voters as they already are in so many affluent and predominantly white precincts. In the Latino community, we often say *su voto es su voz*—your vote is your voice. We must ensure that we take the necessary steps to ensure that the voices of all voters are heard.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise because we must continue to address

the overwhelming evidence of grave voting irregularities and voting rights violations in the recent presidential election in what was the closest and most contested presidential election in the history of our great nation.

It is imperative that Congress continues to engage in a serious review and comprehensive reform of our election process in this nation. The disenfranchisement of voters in the federal electoral process remains a chilling threat to the integrity of our democratic system in America.

Mr. Speaker, The right to vote, and to fully exercise that vote, is a vital component of our collective preservation. On November 7th, 2000, only a fraction of Americans were able to exercise their right to vote and have those votes counted, while thousands, and perhaps even millions of voters were denied this constitutional right as guaranteed by the Fifteenth Amendment.

It is horrifying to me that such systemic mistakes were made in this election. But beyond these mistakes, there have been serious allegations of violations of the Sections 2 and 5 of the Voter Rights Act of 1965, 42 U.S.C. sec. 1973, which mandates the obligation and responsibility of the Congress to provide appropriate implementation of the guarantees of the Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution, which states "the fundamental principle that the right to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the States or the Federal Government on account of race or color." Yet we know today, that such violations of fundamental voting rights did occur during the November 7th elections throughout the nation. These irregularities also raise potential violations of several provisions of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993, 42 U.S.C. sec. 1973gg-5(a) which affirms the right of every U.S. citizen to cast a ballot and have that ballot be counted. We must address this today.

The need for election reform is the challenge of all Americans. President Bush himself recognized this urgency, telling members of Congress: "This is America. Everyone deserves the right to vote." Congress was reaffirmed of President Bush's commitment to the protection of the right to vote when the President's spokesman later assured members of Congress that the "President wants to make certain that one of the focuses of attention this year is electoral reform." A letter recently sent to President Bush by virtually every House Democrat, called on the administration fulfill this promise by providing "essential guidance and leadership on a national problem", yet today, half a year after the election, we are still without such leadership. So I call on the Attorney General of the United States to begin a full investigation of all alleged voting improprieties. We must clear the air.

So what can be done to remedy these problems for the future? According to a recent Washington Post article by David Broder, since the 2000 presidential election more than 1,500 election reform bills have been introduced in state legislatures around this nation. The American Civil Liberties Union and other organizations have been filing suits in California and in other states demanding that uniform methods of casting and counting ballots be put in place. I applaud these efforts and I believe that outdated technology is a large part of the problem.

We also need a greater awareness of how our voting system works. We need better and

more uniform standards, better enforcement, better education, greater and more convenient access to voting places, and a generally easier and more user-friendly electoral process.

To begin to address these problems, I have introduced several important pieces of legislation. I've recently introduced H.R. 934, a bill that would establish National Election Day on the 2nd Tuesday of November, in presidential election years, as a legal public holiday in order to substantially resolve the serious problem of the lack of time for people to vote or participate in the federal election process, due to employment commitments.

This bill would merely federalize what some states have done with great success so that employees in the private sector will be able to exercise their constitutional right to vote or take part in the electoral process as election volunteers with no restraints.

I've also introduced H.R. 60, the Secure Democracy for All Americans Act, which would establish a five member commission and provide funding necessary to perform a study into federal, state, and local voting procedures in order to produce a report and make recommendations for appropriate legislation and administrative actions. This legislation is greatly needed.

In addition, I've recently founded the bipartisan Congressional Election Reform Caucus, which was established to enable all members of Congress to engage in a serious review and dialogue of the election process in this nation as a recognition of the disenfranchisement of voters because of voter confusion, poor voter machinery and work commitments.

I have also drafted legislation that provides for much needed "provisional ballots" so that people erroneously "purged" or dropped from the voting rolls can register at the polls, vote, and have that vote counted. I am also introducing legislation that would create a uniform voter "purging" requirement, because too many states and localities have confusing and conflicting standards of how long you may remain inactive as a voter before your name is purged from the voting rolls. With my legislation, you would have a single uniform 10 years from the time you last voted until you are purged from the rolls. This makes good sense.

I would also like to commend Congressman CUMMINGS for today introducing electoral reform legislation, and for the commitment to this issue by the Congressional Black Caucus and by the many other members of this Congress who believe in this legislation.

These bills affirm our constitutional right, as citizens of this democracy, to vote and have that vote counted, because if our votes are not counted, our voices are not heard. I hope that in the months to come, our voices will come together in support of common-sense solutions and reform, and bring us closer towards our goal of equal access and equal justice under the law.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BALLENGER). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

A NEW ERA OF DEFENSE PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND INDIA IS ON THE HORIZON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I believe that a new era of a defense partnership between the United States and India is on the horizon. I come to the House floor this evening to discuss the potential for stronger defense ties between these two nations.

This relationship between the United States and India makes sense, and it is time that the world's two greatest democracies come together as natural allies. Ultimately, Mr. Speaker, I would like to see India and the U.S. form a stable defense alliance. Such an alliance would help secure our national security and those of our allies while isolating nations such as China, which pose a threat to India and other Asian democracies.

Assistant Secretary of State Richard Armitage, who called on New Delhi in a visit last weekend, said that he was very pleased with the warm support and cooperation extended by the Indian government on various matters, including defense and military cooperation. Bridging a new defense relationship with India would be remarkable, given the history of this nation's ties with the United States in the past.

During the Cold War, India unofficially joined hands with Russia in the non-alignment movement. This created tense relations between the United States and India, and ultimately the U.S. viewed India negatively. However, the Cold War is over. We have no reason to view India as a threat.

In fact, India and the United States have many similar democratic interests, and as a result, both countries could work together and work together well against the threat from a military buildup in China or from rogue nations in Asia that threaten American interests.

Mr. Speaker, Americans are still reeling from the incident last month when Chinese authorities detained a U.S. plane and military personnel. This incident and others exacerbate the difference between our democratic system and China's Communist regime. It highlights the need to have India, a stable democracy for over 50 years, as an ally in the region.

It was well documented that the Chinese have transferred missile technologies to rogue nations. The Chinese premier has reaffirmed this during a recent visit to Pakistan, during which he disclosed his commitment to helping Pakistan develop its military.

Threats to U.S. security loom large in Asia. Pakistan is politically unstable, is full of terrorism, as is documented in the U.S. annual terrorism