not really call it the Republican side. We really have a bipartisan approach to this. But he is the chief of staff for the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. I want to acknowledge the Democratic side staff: Mike Sheehy, Wyndee Parker, Beth Larson, Carolyn Bartholomew, Chris Healey for her good work on our issues, Kirk McConnell, Bob Emmett, and Ilene Romack, who work so hard for us.

I want to commend our chairman for his leadership. It was interesting to work with the Senate on this bill. So I commend the chairman, the new Democratic chairman, Senator GRAHAM, and Senator SHELBY for their cooperation as well. With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers and I just wanted to finish this with some thoughts about how grateful I am and how privileged I am, indeed honored, to serve with such wonderful members. That is a select committee. And I mean it. We have heard today from the chairman and the ranking members of the four subcommittee we now have because we have so much business on the committee. But the others who did not speak, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), have all contributed mightily to this.

It is obviously a wonderful select committee to have and be able to work with and we are backed up with the kind of staff that we have as the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) has said, with Mike Sheehy and Tim Sample and Chris Barton, our top staff keeping us on the track. I think we are able to do our job well. And, of course, a big part of that is the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), who has been outstanding with her time, her energy, her attention and her leadership when she has one or two other things to do, I understand, in her portfolio of responsibilities as well.

It is a very good situation for us. I think the people of the United States of America sometimes wonder what the job of Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence is and need to be reassured that today we are talking about advocacy for sure. That is part of our job. We need to make sure that our folks out there have the tools they need to do the job, to do national security.

But the other side of our job is oversight. We do it very diligently and dutifully. And that is to make sure that all of these awesome capabilities are used in a way that is entirely lawful and within keeping of character of the goals and wishes and the standards of the people of the United States of America.

We do not have a 1–800 number to flash across the bottom of the screen to say if you have a problem. But we are there as your oversight committee, and if there are problems, we are responsible for dealing with them. And I think we take that seriously, very seriously indeed.

Having said all of that, I think that we have with all of this wonderful good will, and responding to the tasks before us, come up with a good piece of legislation which is urgently needed. I see my friend, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), sitting over there. A lot of us have taken credit and heaped praise back and forth on the work that has been done. A lot of the success we are enjoying today that you are seeing on CNN is coming from the hard work of the people who went before us on the oversight committees. And I take my hat off to those people because they too understood the need.

I am very sorry this year my friend Julian Dixon is not with us to be able to see some of the results of some of his hard work, and I know I am joined on that from my colleagues on the other side. Fortunately, there are always people to come along to fill shoes, and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) has done that so well. Having said that, I urge adoption of this particular conference report.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this conference report and commend the conferees and the professional staff for their hard work.

Specifically, I wanted to express my appreciation for the inclusion of the language I offered as an amendment that requires that the Central Intelligence Agency assume 100 percent of the cost of personal liability insurance for certain CIA employees involved in counter-terrorism activities.

Mr. Speaker, for 10 years I served with the Central Intelligence Agency. I spent five years overseas engaged in intelligence collection, counter-intelligence and, in some cases, counter-terrorism.

The work was difficult and dangerous. This fact has been reaffirmed by the terrible death of CIA operations officer, Johnny Micheal Spann, who was the first American to die in combat in Afghanistan in the fight against terrorism last week. But at no time did I doubt that my government would protect me from any personal liability if I encountered a lawsuit as a consequence of my professional duties.

Today, I understand that CIA officers engaged in counter-terrorism activities are virtually required to have personal liability insurance; but the CIA pays only half of the premium. What incentive does a CIA Case Officer have to do the job if he or she is subject to liability lawsuits? Why would they take any risks if the government were unwilling to cover the cost of liability?

I understand that I served in a different time. But I did have the backing of my government—100 percent. It is time to give this assurance back to our Case Officers, many of whom are on the front lines of the war on terrorism.

This is not an original idea. In fact, it was a recommendation of the Report of the National Commission on Terrorism, titled ''Countering the Changing Threat of International Terrorism'' submitted to Congress in June of 2000.

The report states, ''The risk of personal liability arising from actions taken in an official capacity discourages law enforcement and intelligence personnel from taking bold actions to combat terrorism.''

Following the tragic events of September 11th, it is apparent that we must do better in our counter-terrorism effort. The least that we can do is guarantee that any CIA officer participating in the war on terrorism will have the full backing of the federal government. They deserve no less.

Passage of this conference report will provide this full backing. It also maintains the authority of the Director of Central Intelligence to designate those CIA employees who qualify for this benefit.

Again, I thank the Members and staff of the House and Senate Intelligence committees for their hard work on this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1215

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2883, the conference report just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3295, HELP AMERICA VOTE ACT OF 2001

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 311 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 311

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3295) to establish a program to provide funds to States to replace punch card voting systems, to establish the Election Assistance Commission to assist in the administration of Federal elections and to otherwise provide assistance with the administration of certain Federal election laws and programs, to establish minimum election administration standards

for States and units of local government with responsibility for the administration of Federal elections, and for other purposes. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The amendment recommended by the Committee on House Administration now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill, as amended, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), the ranking member of the Committee on Rules; pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. REYNOLDS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 311 is a closed rule providing for consideration of H.R. 3295, the Help America Vote Act of 2001, with 1 hour of debate in the House, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration.

The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. Additionally, the rule provides that the amendment recommended by the Committee on House Administration now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted.

And finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, last year's Presidential election was the most dramatic and most memorable in recent history. Election reform is not a new concept, but last fall was a stark reminder of the modifications that our voting system desperately needs. Voter fraud and faulty machines are only a few examples of the inadequacies of the system. That is why I am proud to stand before you today not only as a member of the Committee on Rules but also a member of the Committee on House Administration.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), chairman of the Committee on House Administration, and the ranking member of that committee, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), have approached this issue with open minds, and their cooperation has produced the bipartisan legislation before us today. I commend their efforts as well as the efforts of my other colleagues on the Committee on House Administration, both Republican and Democrat.

This legislation represents the true essence of bipartisanship. In fact, of the 170 total cosponsors, there are more Democratic cosponsors than there are Republican. Politics was put aside in order to strike an appropriate middle ground. Mr. Speaker, this is not a one-time fix miracle solution to election reform. However, this is a first step, a bipartisan step in the continuing effort to update and modernize the way Americans actively participate in our democratic process.

The Help America Vote Act of 2001 offers the best opportunity to pass real, comprehensive, and truly bipartisan election reform legislation before the end of session. While careful and thoughtful consideration was given to this issue throughout the year, America should not have to wait any longer. Before we know it, another election cycle will be upon us, and, so far, many States have had to rely on their own resources to modify the election systems. It is time for the Federal government to step up to the plate. Not only will this legislation infuse considerable funding into election reform initiatives, it will supply States with minimum election standards to reduce the frequency of inadequate, inaccurate, or duplicate voting.

The bill also addresses the issues of overseas voting. I am pleased that Chairman NEY was able to include some of the provisions in the manager's amendment that is now a part of this rule. Our men and women in uniform around the world should be afforded the same ease and efficiency of voting as all Americans. The most fundamental privilege of American citizenship is the right to vote.

Let us now embrace the spirit of bipartisanship that produced this legislation by supporting this bill and preserving the very integrity of democracy. At last night's Committee on Rules hearing on this bill, Chairman NEY said, ''We want fair elections.'' I urge my colleagues to join me in taking that first step towards fair elections by supporting this rule and the underlying bipartisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Last year's elections brought to light, Mr. Speaker, troubling deficiencies in our electoral system, leaving many Americans disillusioned about our democracy itself. We are all, of course, painfully aware of the tragedy in Florida, which culminated on this very day 1 year ago. But the problem was clearly larger than that, so the Democratic Caucus' Special Committee on Election Reform, under the able leadership of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), spent much of the past year conducting field hearings in communities around the Nation. The committee confirmed what so many others have found; that America's electoral system is broken, and that Americans from coast to coast have been disenfranchised in every election.

In my own Congressional District in Fort Worth, Texas last year, I personally witnessed and fought against a systematic partisan campaign to harass, intimidate, and suppress African American voters, especially senior citizens. For all these reasons, real election reform is a priority for the American people, and it is a passion for Democrats.

But protecting every American's right to vote should not be a partisan issue. It is the cornerstone to rebuilding faith in our democracy, and it is the civil rights issue of the new millennium. That is why Democrats have worked so hard to find bipartisan solutions to the ills that plague America's electoral system. And this bill, H.R. 3295, the Help America Vote Act, provides a very good start.

Chairman NEY and Ranking Member HOYER deserve tremendous credit for crafting a bipartisan approach to get election reform started. This bill sets minimum national election standards and provides Federal assistance for the States to improve ballot counting, access to the polls, and voter registration. It authorizes $2.65 billion for this overhaul, including $400 million to help States replace their punch card voting systems.

It also establishes an Election Assistance Commission to oversee the program, creates a variety of programs to get students involved as poll workers, and includes provisions intended to facilitate absentee voting by military and other overseas voters.

Unfortunately, the bill does not go as far as many Democrats believe it should. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, it does not get us all the way there. So the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the vice chair of the Democratic Caucus, had an amendment to improve this bill to achieve comprehensive election reform. And certainly we should all be able to agree on helping Americans with disabilities vote, on ensuring States meet the standards of this bill, and on ensuring compliance with other standards like the Voting Rights Act and the National Voter Registration Act. So the decision of the Committee on Rules last night to issue a closed rule, and particularly to deny the gentleman from New Jersey his right to offer his amendment, is inexcusable.

Election reform need not be a partisan issue, Mr. Speaker, but Republican leaders insist on trying to make it one. For that reason, I urge that this rule be defeated, and that we force Republican leaders to take a bipartisan approach to election reform.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule. This is great work done by the ranking member and the chairman. I want to point out one provision in this that I really am appreciative of, which is a self-executing provision in this rule that does address the disabled community, especially the blind and the visually impaired at the voting booth.

Everyone should have a right to cast a truly secret ballot. Unfortunately, with current voting methods, the visually impaired have to rely upon others to help them cast their votes. New voting technologies can enable the blind to complete their own ballots without assistance. The language included in this bill requires nonvisual access to be an essential component of any new voting machines designed for Federal elections. It also provides financial assistance to help local election officials pay for the cost of these machines.

I know the election officials in downstate Illinois have been doing a great job in ensuring that elections are run smoothly and that everyone who wants to vote is given the chance to do so. I am pleased that this amendment helps make voting easier for the visually impaired voters.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. EHRLICH), along with the Ranking Member HOYER and Chairman NEY for working on this issue and helping to get this provision included in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD a letter from the National Federation of the Blind supporting this bill.

NATIONAL FEDERATION
OF THE BLIND,
Baltimore, MD, December 11, 2001.

Hon. ROBERT NEY,
Chairman, Committee on House Administration, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to express the support of the National Federation of the Blind for the Help America Vote Act of 2001 (H.R. 3295), including language we requested to address the needs of people who are blind. Thanks to your efforts and understanding, this legislation points the way for blind people to vote privately and independently.

While the 2000 election demonstrated significant problems with our electoral system, consensus regarding the solution has been much more difficult to find. Nonetheless, it is clear that installation of up-to-date technology will occur throughout the United States. This means that voting technology will change, and devices purchased now will set the pattern for decades to come. Therefore, requirements for nonvisual access must be an essential component of the new design.

With more than 50,000 members, representing every state, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, the NFB is the largest organization of blind people in the United States. As such we know about blindness from our own experience. The right to vote and cast a truly secret ballot is one of our highest priorities, and modern technology can now support this goal. For that reason, we support any legislation that will accomplish this objective. Thank your for your assistance in addressing this concern as part of the Help America Vote Act of 2001.

Sincerely,

JAMES GASHEL,
Director of Governmental Affairs.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), for yielding me this time and for his distinguished leadership on this particular subject, and also my good friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS).

All the members of the Committee on Rules heard me last night speak very passionately, moved by the fact that now we have a year that has passed and we still have not undertaken what I believe to be what the American people want in the way of ensuring that we have free, fair, and transparent elections.

Before I get into the meat of my remarks, I want to share a vignette with everybody here. In 1974, in Florida, I ran for the Public Service Commission, and I lost that election by 2 percentage points. When I got home that night, my mother said to me, ''Something is wrong.'' My comment to her was, ''Mom, there can't be anything wrong with this election.'' I was kind of angry, upset, and hurt that I had lost. I said ''There can't be anything wrong, because we have this new punch card system.''

Well, now, 30-plus years have passed since that election, and the fact of the matter is that she has said to me, at times when we have spoken privately, that she thought something was wrong. And now I can say to you, ''Mom, you were right, something was wrong all that time.''

Mr. Speaker, I would like to think that when I speak on the floor, my words are eloquent and my thoughts are well expressed. But now is not the time for eloquence. Quite frankly, this rule just stinks. More than 13 months have passed since last year's debacle of an election. Now, when the House finally considers election reform legislation, the Republican leadership is eliminating the option of debate. The only word that I can use to describe this irresponsible act of poor leadership is shameful.

During last night's hearing in the Committee on Rules, more than 20 amendments were offered by Members on both sides of the aisle. I offered four amendments that would have fixed some of the problems that I believe currently exist in the bill.

□ 1230

My amendments would have required that every polling place in the country be fully accessible to people with disabilities, and somebody please tell me why we cannot accomplish that. They would have taken significant steps, my amendments, towards halting the illegal purging of voters' names, provided for the immediate restoration of former felons' rights to vote; and, finally, ensure that all Americans be given the right to cast a provisional ballot in the case their name does not appear on the list of eligible voters.

However, the American people will never hear debate on these amendments, nor the more than 16 others, because the rule that the Republican leadership has reported is closed. Not one amendment that was offered last night will be permitted to be debated today. Granted, I do not agree with all of the amendments that were offered last night. In fact, I am quite opposed to some of them. However, if the House is going to consider an issue as important as the integrity of the American election system, I think that it should be open for debate. I believe that, and I believe the American people do also.

Where has the leadership been on this issue? From the looks of this rule, we can tell where the leaders on the other side of the aisle have been. But what about the administration, the primary beneficiary of last year's sham of an election? The answer is we just do not know.

I asked the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) what is the position of the administration. To date, the administration has not even issued a statement on the Ney-Hoyer bill that is being considered.

Mr. Speaker, realize I applaud the work of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) on the work that they have done on this bill; and so should the rest of this body, and we should thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) for helping to improve this measure.

Under the constraints that were placed on the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), I do not think that we could have gotten a better bill. I am nonetheless astonished while we know what problems exist, and all of us know how to remedy them, I was astonished by the unwillingness of the Republican leadership to act on a bill that actually fixes all of the problems that exist in our country's broken election system, and it baffles me beyond comprehension that we are not doing it.

If the underlying bill is the best that we can do, then it is not good enough. If we are to define our democracy by the rights we guarantee to our citizens and the methods by which we choose our leaders, then we must never find ourselves denying these rights or questioning the results of our methods.

Mr. Speaker, few issues in this country ignite the tempers of the American citizenry as much as election reform. In the past year, many of us traveled across the country to hear voters speaking about the problems that they faced during last year's election. From these hearings and meetings, we have

garnered a general understanding that the problems we saw in Florida last year are not unique to Florida. On the contrary, the travesty that the Florida's voters faced last November is merely a representative sample of the problems voters faced throughout the United States. Civil rights violations, lack of provisional ballots, increasing amounts of overvotes and undervotes, uneducated voters and poll workers, outdated voting machines, the purging of eligible voters, confusing ballots, lack of accessibility, and not enough funding for States to improve their voting technology, are not problems that are unique to Florida.

The Ney-Hoyer bill fixes many of these problems, but at the same time it fails to mandate that others be addressed. Today, Members are faced with a difficult question: Do we allow the perfect to be the enemy of the good, or do we approve a bill that does not fix all of the problems that we know exist in our election system to date? This rule is not, in my view, just irresponsible and shameful; but it is an insult to this body, the American people and the integrity of our democracy. I urge my colleagues to oppose this closed rule.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS).

(Mr. GEKAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the rule at hand and the bill that follows; but I must place into the RECORD my concern that the entire process did not go far enough with respect to election reform, and that has to do with the rampant number of complaints that every Member has received about the failings of the motor voter law. This bill and the rule that implements it, actually specifically states that the motor voter law that we passed in 1993 will remain practically inviolate. Yet the horror stories we have heard demands our attention to motor voter.

In that regard, I fashioned a Motor Voter Reform Task Force in my district which made certain findings and recommendations. The findings to which we must pay attention are very serious. Number one, there were a large number, not just in my district but in other districts as well, of people who were not American citizens who, by virtue of motor voter flaws, were able to cast votes. That is unacceptable. That dilutes the votes of people who are American citizens who are registered to vote. We must do something about that. Our task force has recommendations as to that, and this bill does not cover that particular situation.

Insofar as the bill goes to determining and helping States determine eligibility of voters to allow culling of votes to bring them up to date every couple of years, the bill goes a long way.

I hope in some future time that Congress tackles revision of motor voter, updating motor voter in a time and a place where we can concentrate on the flaws that everyone has discovered.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the report of my Motor Voter Reform Task Force.

MOTOR VOTER REFORM TASK FORCE REPORT

INTRODUCTION

The Motor Voter Task Force was created in May of 2001, by Congressman Gekas of the 17th Congressional District to investigate the effects of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993. In June, the Task Force visited the five County Election Offices and also spoke to Jury Commissioners in the five counties in the Congressman's district and met with Pennsylvania's Commissioner Dick Filling and Ted Koval, Pennsylvania's Director of Voter Registration, both of whom serve under the Bureau of Commissions, Elections and Legislation. On July 9th, the Task Force held a hearing involving the five County Registrars, a representative from Penn DOT, a representative from the Department of State, and two Representatives from the Pennsylvania State House. The Task Force has also researched data concerning elections at the local, State and National level.

Although the Motor Voter Law of 1993 did make voter registration easier, it failed in its stated goals, it has incurred great cost to the American taxpayer, it has made maintaining the voter registration rolls more difficult, and it has facilitated voter fraud.

We, the Motor Voter Reform Task Force, believe the Motor Voter Act must be reformed to stop the current strains on our electoral system.

PROBLEM SPECIFICS

The Motor Voter Law, officially known as the National Voter Registration Act of 1993, allowed a potential voter to register while applying for, or renewing, a driver's license.

Motor Voter Has Caused Bloated Registration Rolls

While this Act made it easier to register to vote, it simultaneously made it much more difficult for election officials to remove inactive voters from the rolls.

Under the Motor Voter Act, all registered voters who have not had any activity (have not voted, changed address, changed name) are sent a ''Five-Year Notice.'' If the registered voter responds to the notice, they are coded ''active'' and remain on the rolls. If they do not respond, or if the Notice is undeliverable, they are coded as ''inactive'' and remain on the rolls until two more Federal elections have passed without any activity. Any registered voter who has been coded as inactive and remains on the rolls, may vote by asking for an ''Affirmation of Elector''. The Affirmation of Elector will activate their registration by verifying address information.

In addition, once every calendar year, counties are required by the Law to do either a mass mailing, or a cross-referencing with the U.S. Postal Service's National Change of Address Listing. This is a national list of residents by name and address in the country. Any address discrepancy between the county's address list and the National Change of Address list will trigger a notice to be mailed to the registered voter in question. Mass mailings are extremely expensive to counties costing tens of thousands of dollars. The National Change of Address Listing compiled by the U.S. Postal Service is less expensive, but also costs counties several thousand dollars to purchase. Some consideration should be given to making this list available to counties at either no cost or at a minimal cost.

All told, it may take up to nine years for an inactive voter to be removed from the registration rolls. This causes woefully inaccurate voter registries and the potential for fraud. The Task Force believes this is unacceptable.

The Motor Voter System Allows Fraudulent Registration

The Motor Voter Act requires only the ''minimum amount of information necessary'' to assess the eligibility of a registrant. Ironically, this minimum information is often insufficient in determining a registrant's eligibility. Because proof of identity and citizenship is not required when registering to vote, it is possible for resident aliens (i.e., non-citizens) to vote in our elections. There were several reported incidents in the 17th congressional district where non-citizens were registered to vote. This means that the fundamental right of legitimate Americans to vote is being undermined. It is alarming to think that American citizens may be letting fraudulent voters decide the outcome of their local, State and Federal elections.

Just as alarming is the fact that voter registration rolls are used across America as a source for selecting jurors. It is very possible that non-citizens have already been called for jury duty and have served. It was also discovered in conversation with Jury Commissioners is the 17th Congressional District that, indeed, jurors had been called who had registered to vote through Motor Voter, but were not citizens of the U.S.A. We must consider the possible serious consequences if a juror is discovered to be a non-citizen during a trial. If a non-citizen juror went undetected, the defendant's right to a jury of peers would be debased.

Evidence of Fraud

During the 2000 Presidential Election, the national media reported numerous cases of voter fraud. The shortcomings of Motor Voter are the reason behind several notable failings of our electoral system.

Examples of these weaknesses are vivid and well documented: A dog was registered to vote in St. Louis, Missouri, deceased individuals registered and voted, nonexistent individuals registered and voted, and false addresses were used to register. Eighteen municipalities in Allegheny County, Pennsylvania, reported a registry larger than the voting-age population. Clerical errors caused legitimate, eligible voters to be taken off registration rolls and/or listed in the wrong county.

Costs of the Motor Voter System

The Motor Voter Act has caused massive expense to the American public. Furthermore, the Act was an unfunded Federal mandate, so all expenses incurred were passed on to the States and counties. The extra costs have accrued in three basic areas: equipment, postage, and staff.

Equipment: The States have had to upgrade or install new technology at their respective Departments of Motor Vehicles to comply with the Motor Voter Law. Simultaneously, counties have had to upgrade or install new technology, provide additional polling places and purchase extra voting machines or booths and balloting materials, as State laws often requires the number of polls and equipment to be in a certain proportion to the number of registered votes. E.g., Pennsylvania state law requires one voting machine per 600 registered voters.

Postage: The Act required municipalities to send confirmation mailings to remove inactive voters from the registration rolls. Simultaneously, Motor Voter registrations are often left inaccurate or incomplete. Thus, election officials must frequently send mailings and make countless telephone calls in order to recollect information from people who registered through Motor Voter.

Staff: Additional election staff is now required at the State and county levels due to the increased numbers of mailings, polling machines, and polling locations.

Motor Voter Has Done Little to Increase Voter Turnout

While Motor Voter has increased the number of registered voters, it had done little to increase actual voter turnout.

Appendices A and B contain information taken from the Federal Elections Commission web site. Since voter turnout is traditionally better during a Presidential Election year, it is necessary to compare sets of years with the same number of Presidential Elections. Hence, both tables contain voter enumerations from three Federal elections, with each table containing one Presidential Election.

Appendix A comprises three years before Motor Voter was enacted and Appendix B spans three subsequent years after the Motor Voter Law was passed.

The difference between the two sets of elections is a mere 0.3% increase in voter turnout. The enormous costs of the Motor Voter system is hardly worth this questionable increase. Seven years after this Act became law, we have learned from experience and research that voter registration is not the impediment to low voter turnout. In fact, statistics published by the Federal Elections Commission shows that voter turnout has remained fairly constant since 1972.

The bloated registration rolls have made it very difficult to accurately report voting statistics. Percentages of voting seem lower because registration is so bloated. In reality, as stated above, voter turnout has remained about the same since 1972. The inaccurate interpretation of the statistics which are being reported may be adding to voter apathy and having an adverse effect on voter turnout.

For an example, in Congressman Gekas's district, we can look to Lancaster County's swelling registration rolls which have not produced increased voter turnout. If we compare the number of Motor Voter registrations in Lancaster County to the number who actually vote, a significant difference is observed. (Appendix C)

SUMMARY OF FAILINGS

The Motor Voter Law has four intended purposes, as per section b:

(1) To establish procedures that will increase the number of eligible citizens who register to vote in elections for Federal office;

(2) to make it possible for Federal, State, and local governments to implement this Act in a manner that enhances the participation of eligible citizens as voters in elections for Federal office;

(3) to protect the integrity of the electoral process; and

(4) to ensure that accurate and current voter registration rolls are maintained.

Contrary to its stated purposes: ineligible citizens have registered to vote, the Federal government has not helped cover the expense of the new system, the integrity of the electoral process has been compromised, and the Law had made it more difficult to purge inactive voters from the rolls. As a result, rolls are neither accurate nor current.

In short, the Motor Voter Law has failed in all four of its intended purposes.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Because the States and counties have invested a great deal of money in the Motor Voter system, it would be irrational and wasteful to repeal the Law. Therefore, the Motor Voter Law must be amended if its various flaws are to be corrected. The Task Force has conceived of nine recommendations for amending the Motor Voter Law.

[Recommendation 1] Provide Monetary Compensation to States and Counties

Since the Motor Voter Law was enacted, there has been a great deal of expense incurred by the States and counties in meeting the Law's requirements. Most of the expenditures are due to additional equipment, postage, and staff. We believe Federal mandates should have Federal funding; it seems appropriate that the Federal government should compensate the states and counties for the overhead the Motor Voter Law created. Additionally, a special reduced postage rate for the official use of State and County Election Boards must be considered.

[Recommendation 2] Mandate Information Sharing between Bureaus to Keep Rolls Accurate

Unless election officials have access to information that disqualifies ineligible voters, these individuals will remain on the rolls. For that reason, we suggest the Immigration and Naturalization Service inform the counties about the citizenship status of registrants, if requested. We also suggest that the each Bureau of Vital Statistics share information with the counties regarding: deaths, marriages, felons, and changes of name, and that State cooperate with each other in order to prevent duplicate or multiple registrations by an individual in multiple States or municipalities in any one state. The U.S. Postal Service should also be a source for National Address Verification. The sharing of information between these Agencies and Bureaus and between States, in particular those states which maintain a central Voter Registry, and counties will allow election officials to maintain much more accurate registration rolls.

[Recommendation 3] Require Counties to Immediately Remove Ineligible Voters

Upon receipt of disqualifying information from a Bureau or Agency, county officials should be required to immediately remove an ineligible voter from the registry, regardless of their activity status.

[Recommendation 4] Rolls Should be Purged of Inactive Voters More Frequently

We recommend automatically removing any voter that should fail to vote in two consecutive Federal elections. Not only would this keep the rolls current and accurate, but it would completely eliminate the cost of sending confirmation mailings. Furthermore, this implementation would allow office holders and candidates running for office to target their constituents more effectively.

[Recommendation 5] Require Proof of Citizenship upon Registering to Vote

Proof of citizenship should be required of everyone upon registering or re-registering to vote. A signed attestation or a check box will not do, as many resident aliens may misunderstand the meaning of the word 'citizen.' There is also the very real possibility that many non-citizens may be taking advantage of the very lax system of voter registration which is now in place. Acceptable forms of proof would be: a passport, a birth certificate, or a naturalization document.

There must also be a system in place to make certain that everyone who registers to vote is indeed a real and living human being residing at an actual address in the county and state where they are registering.

[Recommendation 6] Voter Identification Number

A Voter Identification Card with an assigned Voter ID Number, a photo, and a digitized signature for every registered voter could be sent to County Election Boards to be kept in the voter registration roll books used by each county at each polling place. There must be a system in place to protect the confidential nature of these numbers. Otherwise, their purpose would be defeated. The Voter ID Numbers should be available only to Election Officials and the voter to whom the number is issued.

[Recommendation 7] Require Better Checks at the Polls

In addition to preventing registration fraud, better checks must be in order to prevent it at the polls as well. To keep anyone from voting under another person's name, there need to be better identity checks at the polls. A signature and presentation of a photo ID should be required of all voters. This should then be compared to the Voter ID Card in the county's roll book.

[Recommendation 8] Verification of Absentee Ballot Applications and Absentee Ballots

There must be a better system in place for verifying the authenticity of Absentee Ballot Applications and Absentee Ballots

[Recommendation 9] Personnel Training

All personnel mandated and responsible for registering voters as provided by the National Voter Registration Act of 1993, must receive comprehensive and intensive training in an attempt to prevent inaccurate, incomplete or fraudulent applications for voter registration.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED

In conclusion, it is with sincere thanks to Congressman Gekas for his concern to insure a voting system with the utmost integrity, that we submit our findings and recommendations.

APPENDIX A.—THREE ELECTIONS BEFORE MOTOR VOTER

Year	VAP	No. registered	% Registered	No. voted	% Voted
1990	185,812,000	121,105,630	65.18	67,859,189	36.52
1988	182,778,000	126,379,628	69.14	91,594,693	50.11
1986	178,566,000	118,399,984	66.31	64,991,128	36.40
Total	547,156,000	365,885,242	66.87%	224,445,010	41.02%

APPENDIX B.—THREE ELECTIONS AFTER MOTOR VOTER

Year	VAP	No. registered	% Registered	No. voted	% Voted
1998	200,929,000	141,850,558	70.60	73,117,022	36.39
1996	196,511,000	146,211,960	74.40	96,456,345	49.08
1994	193,650,000	130,292,822	67.28	75,105,860	38.78
Total	591,090,000	418,355,340	70.78%	244,679,227	41.39%

APPENDIX C.—LANCASTER COUNTY MOTOR VOTER REGISTRATION STATISTICS

	Total MV registrations	Total MV to vote	Percentage
Fall 1995	36	3	8.33
Spring 1996	38	4	10.53
Fall 1996	39	16	41.03
Spring 1997	40	3	7.50
Fall 1997	42	5	11.90
Spring 1998	3,275	44	1.34
Fall 1998	5,568	1,167	20.96
Spring 1999	10,074	571	5.67
Fall 1999	12,324	928	7.53
Spring 2000	15,334	819	5.34
Fall 2000	18,922	10,581	55.92
Spring 2001	21,701	589	2.71

VAP: Voting-Age Population.
MV: Motor Voter.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we arrive at a point where I think we will be considering the election reform bill, the Help America Vote Act. I believe this bill is one of the most important bills that we will vote on and pass this year. I am disappointed that the rule did not allow a substitute to be offered. I asked for that in the Committee on Rules. I urged that that be allowed.

Frankly, if the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), who is the sponsor of a very significant bill that is pending in the House Committee on the Judiciary, had wanted to offer his substitute, I would have been even more adamant.

Having said that, I want to see this bill move forward. I regret this rule did not allow a substitute, but I believe it is important that we pass this bill and pass it today. It provides, as I will say in the general debate later today, very substantial resources for States to get us to a point where votes will not only be cast, but will be accurately counted; where votes will be counted, having made sure that every American was able to cast their vote properly; that state-wide registration would make sure that we knew who was registered; that provisional ballots would make sure that, even if we made a mistake in the system, that people would be allowed to vote; where, if the technology allows in 2002, citizens will be told they made a mistake, and if they want to change it, voters have an opportunity to do so.

This bill brings some very significant reforms. It answers many of the questions raised by last year's extraordinarily difficult election. So although I am very deeply distressed, as expressed by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), that we did not have the ability to offer a substitute, I know that the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) will be offering a motion to recommit.

If we pass this rule, I will speak strongly on behalf of this bill and hope to see its passage. The reason that I say that I think it should pass today, I am hopeful that the earliest possible date to both appropriate funds for the funding of the reforms, doing away with the punch cards, upgrading technology, educating voters, educating and training election officials, all to enhance the election process for our citizens, I am hopeful that we can do this as quickly as possible so that 2002 and certainly 2004 will not be a repeat of 2000. That election in 2000 ended 37 days after it began. It ended on this day exactly 1 year ago. It is appropriate that we act today.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I could not agree more with the Committee on House Administration. We need to act today. This is bipartisan legislation. It has the best chance of passing Congress this year and becoming law before next November's elections. Time is of the essence. There are only a few days left in the session of this Congress, and we must act now. The train has sounded its whistle. Election reform must be aboard. The American people expect and deserve real election reform that ensures that every single vote is counted.

Mr. Speaker, there also must be some facts brought into the record as to the result of the Committee on Rules. With 435 Members of Congress, there are 435 ideas. That is important. It brings debate and consensus. But the Committee on Rules also has done the least partisan action today by taking a bipartisan product of 108 Democratic Members and 61 Republicans, which have come together with the bipartisan support of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the ranking member, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), the chairman, and most of us on the Committee on House Administration. It was constructed in a bipartisan way, not only in the hearings and in the committee and in the result of the committee, but in the press conferences.

Quite frankly, maybe not allowing partisanship to come in now as each side of the aisle tries to figure out how they can angle their leverage up, to leverage up their best position on election reform.

A closed rule ensures that the bipartisan bill which actually has more Democratic Members than Republican on it, remains bipartisan. I remind my colleagues for the record in the Chambers and throughout the Capitol that no viable formal substitute came before the Committee on Rules until late in the process. As a matter of fact, in consultation with the other side of the aisle, they did not even know which Member was going to submit a formal amendment. There was no amendment on the summary list that all members, Republican and Democrat, that the Committee on Rules had before them because there was not a formal one presented yet. In the end, the ranking member of the Committee on Rules submitted the Menendez as a substitute.

The reality, as I opened my remarks, is maybe the best way to get a bipartisan result of what started with hearings months ago and came with bipartisan input, bipartisan sponsorship, bipartisan passage in the Committee on House Administration and now before the House under this rule if passed, is the best way to have bipartisanship is to move forward on a bipartisan bill without trying to leverage it up from either side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

(Mr. MENENDEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule because of my belief in one of our core principles, which is ''one person, one vote.'' And it is that simple, but grand, principle we are here to protect. And to limit the debate on election reform which is the foundation of the democracy for which we risk the lives of our young men and women abroad with a closed rule is outrageous. That is why the debate here today goes to the very heart of this institution, the very heart of our democracy, the very heart of our Nation, because we have a solemn responsibility to ensure that every American is given a full and equal access to vote.

The bill before us takes a good step in that direction; but I believe it should go further, and that is why I introduced an amendment at the Committee on Rules with the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) and others to clarify and expand the bill's provisions on full access for disabled voters, civil rights protections, multilingual ballots and materials, Federal enforcement of standards, guarantees for provisional voting and preservation of the Motor Voter Act.

Mr. Speaker, 14 million disabled voters cannot vote in secret. At the beginning of the 21st century, that is an outrage. The bill does not guarantee that that will change; my amendment would.

□ 1245

Hundreds, maybe thousands, of voters were improperly turned away at the polls in the last election, their votes effectively robbed through a careless bureaucracy at best, and malintent at worst. We may never know for sure, but we do know that we need provisional voting to prevent this travesty from ever occurring again. Our amendment would have guaranteed that. The bill we will be voting on today does not. The motor voter law has helped bring so many Americans into the democratic process. Our amendment would have preserved it.

These are vitally important issues that deserved a full and complete debate in the House on the fundamental issue of our democracy and the process by which we choose those who govern us. As it is, I will offer the amendment in the form of a motion to recommit. This bill is too important, too central to who we are, to close off debate as the rule does. I urge my colleagues to defeat it.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by congratulating my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) for not only his handling of this rule, but also for his fine work on the Committee on House Administration and, of course, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) who have, as has been pointed out in this debate, fashioned this bipartisan effort to deal with a very serious problem that exists out there.

We know that it was a year ago today, Mr. Speaker, that we saw a conclusion to the most historic election in our Nation's history for President. If we have learned anything in the past year, it is that democracy is a work in progress.

A year ago this month, I had the opportunity to join with a number of other Americans in representing this country at the inauguration of President Vicente Fox in Mexico. It was the first time in 71 years that the ruling Institutional Revolutionary Party had, in fact, been defeated in a presidential election. I was an observer of that election on July 2 of last year. We as Americans were there in behalf of the International Republican Institute, an arm of the National Endowment for Democracy which President Reagan established in 1985, to talk about how to hold elections and how to encourage democracy and to observe that process a year ago this past July. I will say that to then go into our election process here and see former Secretary of State James Baker, with whom I stood checking the validity of ballots in the hills, above Pueblo, Mexico, doing the same thing in Florida following our presidential election, was clear evidence that democracy is a work in progress.

We also, over the past year, have had at least a couple of other experiences showing us that. Ten years ago in Nicaragua, we were able to bring about a free election, and it saw the removal of the Communist dictator, Daniel Ortega. Many of us who during the 1980s spent a lot of time encouraging the process of democracy and free and fair elections there had a rather rude awakening this year when this summer we found that the prospect of making changes that could have undermined the opportunity for voters to participate in Nicaragua was a serious one. I am happy to say that the International Republican Institute and other organizations played a role in encouraging voter registration and moving towards democracy, clearly showing that even though we saw an election a decade ago, it had to be closely monitored.

Of course, the attention of the world is focused on Afghanistan. Again, a decade ago we saw the liberation of the people of Afghanistan from the Soviet Union. Many of us, after having spent a great deal of time focused on the problems in Afghanistan, chose to put our attention elsewhere.

And so I think that this legislation is a demonstration that we as Americans understand that democracy is a work in progress. That is why I congratulate my colleagues on the Committee on House Administration for coming up with what is, as I said, truly a very bipartisan bill.

Passage of this rule, Mr. Speaker, will ensure that there is language to deal with the issue that the gentleman from New Jersey just raised, and, that is, the access of the disabled to the polls. We have seen organizations like the National Council on the Blind come forward and indicate their willingness to be supportive of this measure. We also know that there are disenfranchised voters in this country, and we are strongly committed, again in a bipartisan way, to ensuring that, in fact, we will see an opportunity for everyone who wants to have the right to vote and access to the voting booth.

It is just a first step, though. That is why I keep referring to this work in progress. We know that there are going changes that will be further proposed in the future. I know that under the leadership of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) on the Committee on House Administration, there will be further efforts to look at this. But as was pointed out by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) in his testimony before the Committee on Rules last night for the first time ever, the Federal Government is stepping up to the plate and providing $2.65 billion in assistance to the States for Federal elections. Never in the history of our Republic has that been done before. This legislation moves us toward doing that.

Yes, it is a closed rule. It is a closed rule because there is strong bipartisan consensus, as was pointed out by both Presidents Carter and Ford, to support this measure, and there are a lot of people out there who do, as the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) said so eloquently, want to game this thing and improve the opportunity for the Republican Party or improve the opportunity for the Democratic Party to maybe get an edge in this. I think that this package, moving forward from this committee under the structure that we have proposed here for consideration by our colleagues, will, in fact, maintain the bipartisan nature of it and move us in a very positive and bold way towards achieving our goal, and, that is, enhancing the opportunity for the American people to choose their leaders.

It is a good measure, it addresses the concerns of the disabled, the concerns of minorities, and I think if there are proposals that others might want to offer, we had guaranteed the motion to recommit, and so that is a package that can come forward from our colleagues who do want to offer some other proposal on this. The rule deserves strong support, and I believe that the legislation at the end of the day deserves strong support as well. I encourage my colleagues to join with us.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON).

Ms. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the two gentlemen who have put in laborious time in crafting legislation which admittedly does advance, does progress the electoral system. We attempted last night through the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) to offer an amendment that was rejected because of the closed rule. I wanted to come to the floor and speak in a bipartisan way, those veterans who are Democrats and those who are Republicans and perhaps those who are libertarians but who form this bipartisan coalition of suffering posttraumatic stress and who end up after war, who have been there protecting this country, who end up homeless, who end up in prison. As we know, many States deny those individuals who have been convicted of felonies from ever having the right to participate in the electoral process.

We do not deny Members of Congress from coming to Congress because they are convicted felons, but we do deny people who have sacrificed their life and their well-being. Our amendment had the support of the Vietnam Veterans Coalition and many others. I would just encourage that we defeat the rule so that we can ascertain that democracy does indeed work.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me

this time. I also want to commend Chairman NEY and Ranking Member HOYER for the development of this legislation, but I rise in strong opposition to this rule. I do not rise because it is a bipartisan bill, I do not rise because it has a large number of supporters, but I rise in opposition to this rule because it is a contradiction to democracy. It is a contradiction to the whole purpose of voting.

Voting is a way of expressing oneself, of expressing one's ideas, thoughts and opinions. This rule denies that opportunity. It is closed. I had offered an amendment that I wanted to offer last night in the Committee on Rules that would deal with the whole question of intimidation, of fraud, by making sure that States had some mechanism in place to deal with that. All of my life I have heard of intimidation and fraud in elections in communities where I have lived and worked. I have never seen anything really done about it. This would have been a great opportunity. It does not exist. For that reason, I urge that we vote down this rule and come back with an open rule that gives people the opportunity to really express what democracy and voting is all about.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ).

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good colleague from Texas for yielding me this time.

H.R. 3295 does not provide the comprehensive reform that this Nation's election system needs. While this bill does attempt to establish minimum standards for voting machines, it does not go far enough. The Federal Government should have the ability to take action against States that fail to meet minimum standards and it is not possible under this bill. The bill has no mandatory access to machines for individuals with disabilities. Citizens who have language barriers or physical disabilities should not have added difficulties when they go to vote.

Current law requires some jurisdictions with language minority groups to provide bilingual assistance in each step of the voting process. However, this law has been poorly enforced and it certainly is not strengthened by this bill. In addition, this bill does not specifically require assistance for elderly voters or for voters with disabilities. Polling places should allow people to exercise their right to vote, regardless of their disability.

Lastly, election reform must also ensure that sample ballots are distributed that educate voters and that poll workers are properly trained to assist the voter. A better informed electorate will be able to make better decisions when voting for their elected officials. Although H.R. 3295 authorizes the use of funds for voter education, it does not require them to be spent for that.

There is one thing I know. Democracy is stronger when more Americans vote. H.R. 3295 is well-intentioned, but it is not the solution to our Nation's needs.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This legislation authorizes $2.65 billion for Federal election reform, including $400 million to buy out unreliable punch card voting systems that was brought out in this rule debate earlier, and $2.25 billion in election fund payments to improve equipment, recruit and train poll workers, improve access for disabled voters, and educate voters about their rights.

The Help America Vote Act would require States to adopt minimum election standards, including a statewide voter registration system, in-precinct provisional voting, assurances that voters who make errors will be able to correct them, and a means for disabled voters to cast secret ballots on new voting equipment. The bill is real, meaningful reform that will significantly improve our election system and restore public confidence in it.

I just want to outline that this bill is a bipartisan bill. It is not a magic elixir for the problems that plagued us last November, but it prescribes the right medicine for our ailing election system and Federal assistance to the States and minimum election standards that they must adopt. This bipartisan bill is the outgrowth of a series of hearings by the Committee on House Administration earlier this year and input from a wide variety of advocates for civil rights, disabilities and election reform groups. Their views were solicited and given serious consideration and this bill reflects their views and their efforts. This bipartisan legislation has been endorsed by the National Association of Secretaries of State as well as the National Conference of State Legislatures, NCSL, and others, like the Carter-Ford Commission.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. It is a bipartisan bill that has the opportunity to be considered by this House today to move forward on election reform.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1300

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT).

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I was sitting in my office and I thought I misunderstood what my colleague who is pushing this rule had to say, and then he said it again, that a bipartisan group of people have gotten together and gotten behind a bill; and, therefore, since you have a bipartisan bill, democracy should be suspended and other people who want to offer their amendments and have their voices be heard should not be given that opportunity.

I got alarmed by that, because quite often that is the way people perceive that democracy works. You get some people kind of at the center of the democracy and they say, well, we represent this perspective and this perspective, one marginally on the progressive side and one marginally on the conservative side, and we represent America, so the rest of America should not be heard.

That is what this rule reminds me of. A small group of people who have decided that this bill should be the vehicle for election reform have gotten together; and the Committee on Rules has said, well, if we break apart this fragile compromise and allow people either on the progressive side or on the conservative side to offer amendments, then somehow democracy will be undermined.

There is something wrong with that analysis. We all come here to represent our districts and to bring our voices to the table, and this process is not allowing that to happen. I hope we will vote down this rule and give us the opportunity to participate.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the right to vote is the cornerstone of our democracy. It is the most basic and most essential expression of citizenship. When that right is put into doubt, when citizens cannot know that a ballot cast is a ballot counted and that their unique voice has been heard. It undermines confidence in our entire political system, as well as the government formed on a foundation of those ballots. People must have confidence that their votes counts.

Last year's Presidential election shook that confidence to the core. And while the Ney-Hoyer bill is a first step toward reforming that system, the substitute that my colleagues and I would have offered, had it been allowed, would have vastly improved on the underlying bill. It would have required that all voting systems and polling places be accessible to disabled and blind voters and that alternative language accessibility be provided for citizens with limited English proficiency.

To accurately record the voter's intent, the amendment would have required that all voting systems notify voters of over- and undervotes, verify the vote, and provide the opportunity to correct the ballot before it was cast. This is particularly important, because the poorest technology, the most error-ridden technology, is often found in the poorest communities.

Our amendment would have allowed voters to be purged from the voter rolls in a way that is consistent with the motor voter law. It required that provisional voting be available for voters whose names have been mistakenly removed from the voter rolls.

Finally, it ensured that these measures are fairly and strictly enforced, by requiring the Attorney General to verify State certification and to enforce the minimum standards. Right now in cities and towns across the

country, it remains more difficult to go to the polls to cast your vote than it is to make a simple withdrawal from an ATM; and there is something very, very wrong with that.

The right to vote is the basic foundation of our rights as American citizens. We need to ensure that every American citizen has access to polling places, is able to cast a secret ballot, and is sure that his or her vote has been accurately counted. This issue is too important to merit anything less than a full and an open debate.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Ms. MCCARTHY).

(Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3295, the Help America Vote Act of 2001. I wholeheartedly endorse the efforts of my colleagues, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), and others in this great effort. It is a very important first step in correcting the mistakes made in our election system that were highlighted in the aftermath of the 2000 election.

While many minority groups such as the NAACP and the Council of LaRaza and senior groups have contacted me expressing concerns that the bill might not go far enough, I have seen firsthand the challenges inadequately equipped polling places and poorly trained poll workers pose to their constituencies.

This measure will go far in assuring everyone's right to access to a vote. I pledge to work with my colleagues in moving forward with this legislation and in future efforts to ensure that no voting population is disenfranchised in our democracy, and that every American, regardless of race, disability, age or creed, is afforded an equal opportunity to have their vote counted.

I am very pleased by the cooperative bipartisan effort behind this legislation. I urge support of it and the rule.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, one of my Democratic colleagues as we voted on this in the Committee on House Administration summed it up so well, so I think the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman NEY) that this is not a perfect bill, properly imply, and undoubtedly apply to every bill that has ever been considered in the Congress of the United States.

Having said that, I think this is a good bill. It is worthy of support, and it will move us forward. With 170 cosponsors on this legislation, 108 Democrats, 61 Republicans and one Independent, I believe as we move forward in passing this rule we will have a substantial vote in the affirmative on this legislation, which will move America forward with safe and solid elections.

The most fundamental privilege of American citizenship is the right to vote. Let us now embrace that spirit of bipartisanship that produced this legislation by supporting this bill and preserving the very integrity of democracy.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for the rule and the bill on election reform, H.R. 3295, brought forward by the Chairman and Ranking Member of the House Administration Committee, Representatives NEY and HOYER.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that local jurisdictions across America have voter registration rolls that are incomplete and grossly inaccurate. The Ney-Hoyer bill offers some real solutions. A $2.25 billion election assistance grant program will help States and localities invest in real solutions for their election system and voter registration problems. Further, the bill mandates statewide voter registration databases to enhance accountability and promote accuracy in voter registration. Pennsylvania has already taken this step and is implementing a statewide registration database that conforms with the requirements of Ney-Hoyer. Unfortunately, the Ney-Hoyer bill does not attack the problems associated with the Motor Voter Act (MVA) head on. The bill reaffirms that law and attempts to clarify some of its language regarding the purging of voter registration rolls. However, I believe Congress must reopen the MVA at some point, and I am committed to making that happen.

I am supporting this important legislation as it reflects many of the findings of a Pennsylvania 17th Congressional District Motor Voter Task Force I initiated in the spring of this year. After the last Presidential election, numerous concerns were raised by local election officials, elected representatives and citizens of central Pennsylvania. These concerns focused on the glaring failings of the Motor Voter Act. I believe that H.R. 3295 goes a long way toward addressing some of the most essential concerns raised in my District. While it is not the final answer, it is a good first step. I will vote for this legislation, but I will vigilantly monitor its implementation to ensure that it does indeed help improve the situation. Moreover, I will work to make sure Congress revisits the failings of the Motor Voter Act more specifically in the future.

In May of this year I appointed three local leaders to a bipartisan task force to study the impact of the MVA on our federal elections. Louisa Gaughen, chairperson, Sue Helm and Leon Czikowsky—together with Task Force Coordinator Jordan Olshefsky—engaged in formal hearings, interviews with election officials and fact finding sessions before drafting their report. The Task Force found that the law, "failed in its stated goals, that it incurred great cost to the American taxpayer, that it has made maintaining the voter registration rolls more difficult, and it has facilitated voter fraud." The MVA was touted as a mechanism for increasing voter registration and voter turnout. However, my task force found that, "[w]hile Motor Voter has increased the number of registered voters, it has done little to increase actual voter turnout." Disturbingly, the task force found that registration increases often are explainable by the fact that non-citizens have been registered to vote. Not only does this undermine the integrity of our election system, it also has adverse effects on our judicial system. For example, all across America jurisdictions use voter registration rolls as a primary source for selecting jurors. A corrupted voter registration list means a corrupted juror pool list.

In fact, the MVA has led to vastly inaccurate and bloated registration rolls. As my task force put it, "[w]hile this Act made it easier to register to vote, it simultaneously made it much more difficult for election officials to remove inactive voters from the rolls." Localities have interpreted the MVA in such a way as to prevent the expeditious removal of names from registration rolls even in cases of death of a registrant because of seemingly contradictory language in the MVA which seems to prevent the removal of a registrant's name upon failure to vote in consecutive federal elections. The Ney-Hoyer bill seeks to clarify this ambiguous language, but based on the recommendations of my task force, I feel Congress will soon have to take a stronger stand. Too many localities have vastly more registered voters than actual, legal voters residing in their jurisdictions. Regular purging of these rolls must happen in order to ensure the credibility of our election system. Ney-Hoyer helps, but we eventually may have to go farther.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated, I support the rule, and I will vote for H.R. 3295, The Help America Vote Act of 2001 because we need to begin the process of election reform in this country. After an unprecedented election year of butterfly ballots, chads, and court challenges, we need to assure the American public that real, practical steps are being taken to ensure that the events of Fall 2000 are never repeated. Ney-Hoyer is a good foundation upon which to build. I ask unanimous consent that the following recommendations of my task force be added to the RECORD.

MOTOR VOTER REFORM TASK FORCE COMMITTEE, COMMISSIONED BY CONGRESSMAN GEORGE W. GEKAS, REPORTED RECOMMENDATIONS, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2001

Because the states and counties have invested a great deal of money in the Motor Voter system, it would be irrational and wasteful to repeal the Law. Therefore, the Motor Voter Law must be amended if its various flaws are to be corrected. The Task Force has conceived of nine recommendations for amending the Motor Voter Law.

Recommendation 1—Provide Monetary Compensation to States and Counties: Since the Motor Voter Law was enacted, there has been a great deal of expense incurred by the States and counties in meeting the Law's requirements. Most of the expenditures are due to additional equipment, postage, and staff. We believe Federal mandates should have Federal funding; it seems appropriate that the Federal government should compensate the states and counties for the overhead the Motor Voter Law created. Additionally, a special reduced postage rate for the official use of State and County Election Boards must be considered.

Recommendation 2—Mandate Information Sharing between Bureaus to Keep Rolls Accurate: Unless election officials have access to information that disqualifies ineligible voters, these individuals will remain on the rolls. For that reason, we suggest the Immigration and Naturalization Service inform the counties about the citizenship status of registrants, if requested. We also suggest that each Bureau of Vital Statistics share information with the counties regarding: deaths, marriages, felons, and changes of name, and that States cooperate with each other in order to prevent duplicate or multiple registrations by an individual in multiple States or municipalities in any one

state. The U.S. Postal Service should also be a source for National Address Verification. The sharing of information between these Agencies and Bureaus and between States, in particular those states which maintain a central Voter Registry, and counties will allow election officials to maintain much more accurate registration rolls.

Recommendation 3—Requires Counties to Immediately Remove Ineligible Voters: Upon receipt of disqualifying information from a Bureau or Agency, county officials should be required to immediately remove an ineligible voter from the registry, regardless of their activity status.

Recommendation 4—Rolls Should be Purged of Inactive Voters More Frequently: We recommend automatically removing any voter that should fail to vote in two consecutive Federal elections. Not only would this keep the rolls current and accurate, but it would completely eliminate the cost of sending confirmation mailings. Furthermore, this implementation would allow office holders and candidates running for office to target their constituents more effectively.

Recommendation 5—Require Proof of Citizenship upon Registering to Vote: Proof of citizenship should be required of everyone upon registering or re-registering to vote. A signed attestation or a check box will not do, as many resident aliens may misunderstand the meaning of the word 'citizen'. There is also the very real possibility that many non-citizens may be taking advantage of the very lax system of voter registration which is now in place. Acceptable forms of proof would be: a passport, a birth certificate, or a naturalization document.

There must also be a system in place to make certain that everyone who registers to vote is indeed a real and living human being residing at an actual address in the county and state where they are registering.

Recommendation 6—Voter Identification Number: A Voter Identification Card with an assigned Voter ID Number, a photo and a digitized signature for every registered voter could be sent to County Elections Boards to be kept in the voter registration roll books used by each county at each polling place. There must be a system in place to protect the confidential nature of these numbers. Otherwise, their purpose would be defeated. The Voter ID Numbers should be available only to Election Officials and the voter to whom the number is issued.

Recommendation 7—Require Better Checks at the Polls: In addition to preventing registration fraud, better checks must be in order to prevent it at the polls as well. To keep anyone from voting under another person's name, there need to be better identity checks at the polls. A signature and presentation of a photo ID should be required of all voters. This should then be compared to the Voter ID Card in the county's roll book.

Recommendation 8—Verification of Absentee Ballot Applications and Absentee Ballots: There must be a better system in place for verifying the authenticity of Absentee Ballot Applications and Absentee Ballots.

Recommendation 9—Personnel Training: All personnel mandated and responsible for registering voters as provided by the National Voter Registration Act of 1993, must receive comprehensive and intensive training in an attempt to prevent inaccurate, incomplete or fraudulent applications for voter registration.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the grounds that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 193, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 487]

YEAS—223

Aderholt
Akin
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Barr
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bereuter
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boozman
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Coble
Collins
Combest
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Eshoo
Everett
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Graham
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kerns
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Meek (FL)
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller, Dan
Miller, Gary
Miller, Jeff
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reynolds
Riley
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schaffer
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (NJ)
Souder
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Traficant
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins (OK)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (FL)

NAYS—193

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank
Frost
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney (CT)
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Miller, George
Mink
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Sherman
Shows
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—17

Ballenger
Burr
Buyer
Cubin
Culberson
Delahunt
Dooley
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Granger
Hostettler
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Luther
Quinn
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Young (AK)

□ 1329

Mr. CONYERS, Ms. McCOLLUM, and Ms. McCARTHY of Missouri changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, because of a hearing in the Committee on Financial Services on Enron, I missed the previous vote, the rule on election reform. If I had been here, I would have cast a vote for no on the rule.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, this is to inform you that on rollcall No. 487,

I inadvertently voted "yes" when my intention was to vote "no".

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING PROCEDURES AND DEADLINE FOR FILING AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 1542, INTERNET FREEDOM AND BROADBAND DEPLOYMENT ACT OF 2001

(Mr. DREIER Asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, this is an announcement that I think Members might be interested in.

Mr. Speaker, today a Dear Colleague letter is going to be sent to all Members informing them that the Committee on Rules is planning to meet this week to grant a rule which may limit the amendment process for H.R. 1542, the Internet Freedom and Broadband Deployment Act of 2001.

Any Member who wishes to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies of the amendment and one copy of a brief explanation of the amendment by 2 p.m. on Thursday. That is 24½ hours from now. That is December 13. It should be sent up to the Committee on Rules, H–312 in the Capitol.

Mr. Speaker, the bill, as our colleagues know, was reported favorably by the Committee on Energy and Commerce on May 24, and ordered reported, adversely, by the Committee on the Judiciary on June 18. Amendments should be drafted to the text of the bill as reported by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, which will be available on the Web sites of both the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted, and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain that their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

HELP AMERICA VOTE ACT OF 2001

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 311, I call up the bill (H.R. 3295) to establish a program to provide funds to States to replace punch card voting systems, to establish the Election Assistance Commission to assist in the administration of Federal elections and to otherwise provide assistance with the administration of certain Federal election laws and programs, to establish minimum election administration standards for States and units of local government with responsibility for the administration of Federal elections, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). Pursuant to House Resolution 311, the bill is considered read for amendment.

The text of H.R. 3295 is as follows:

H.R. 3295

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Help America Vote Act of 2001".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—PUNCH CARD VOTING MACHINES

Subtitle A—Replacement of Machines

Sec. 101. Establishment of program.
Sec. 102. Eligibility.
Sec. 103. Amount of payment.
Sec. 104. Audit and repayment of funds.
Sec. 105. Punch card voting system defined.

Subtitle B—Enhancing Performance of Existing Systems

Sec. 111. Establishment of program.
Sec. 112. Eligibility.
Sec. 113. Amount of payment.
Sec. 114. Audit and repayment of funds.

Subtitle C—General Provisions

Sec. 121. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 122. Punch card voting system defined.

TITLE II—COMMISSION

Subtitle A—Establishment and General Organization

PART 1—ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION

Sec. 201. Establishment.
Sec. 202. Duties.
Sec. 203. Membership and appointment.
Sec. 204. Staff.
Sec. 205. Powers.
Sec. 206. Limitation on rulemaking authority.
Sec. 207. Authorization of appropriations.

PART 2—ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION STANDARDS BOARD AND BOARD OF ADVISORS

Sec. 211. Establishment.
Sec. 212. Duties.
Sec. 213. Membership of Standards Board.
Sec. 214. Membership of Board of Advisors.
Sec. 215. Powers of boards; no compensation for service.
Sec. 216. Status of boards and members for purposes of claims against board.

Subtitle B—Voluntary Election Standards

Sec. 221. Development of voluntary election standards.
Sec. 222. Technical standards development committee.
Sec. 223. Process for adoption of voluntary standards.
Sec. 224. Certification and testing of voting systems.
Sec. 225. Dissemination of information.

Subtitle C—Election Assistance

PART 1—ELECTION FUND PAYMENTS TO STATES FOR VOTING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS

Sec. 231. Election fund payments to States for voting system improvements.
Sec. 232. Allocation of funds.
Sec. 233. Conditions for receipt of funds.
Sec. 234. Authorization of appropriations.

PART 2—GRANTS FOR RESEARCH ON VOTING TECHNOLOGY IMPROVEMENTS

Sec. 241. Grants for research on voting technology improvements.
Sec. 242. Report.
Sec. 243. Authorization of appropriations.

PART 3—PILOT PROGRAM FOR TESTING OF EQUIPMENT AND TECHNOLOGY

Sec. 251. Pilot program.
Sec. 252. Report.
Sec. 253. Authorization of appropriations.

PART 4—MISCELLANEOUS

Sec. 261. Role of National Institute of Standards and Technology.
Sec. 262. Reports.
Sec. 263. Audit.

TITLE III—HELP AMERICA VOTE COLLEGE PROGRAM

Sec. 301. Establishment of Program.
Sec. 302. Activities under Program.
Sec. 303. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE IV—HELP AMERICA VOTE FOUNDATION

Sec. 401. Help America Vote Foundation.

TITLE V—MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR STATE ELECTION SYSTEMS

Sec. 501. Minimum standards for State election systems.
Sec. 502. Standards described.
Sec. 503. Enforcement.
Sec. 504. Effective date.

TITLE VI—VOTING RIGHTS OF MILITARY MEMBERS AND OVERSEAS CITIZENS

Sec. 601. Voting assistance programs.
Sec. 602. Designation of single State office to provide information on registration and absentee ballots for all voters in State.
Sec. 603. Report on absentee ballots transmitted and received after general elections.
Sec. 604. Simplification of voter registration and absentee ballot application procedures for absent uniformed services and overseas voters.
Sec. 605. Additional duties of Presidential designee under Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act.

TITLE VII—REDUCED POSTAGE RATES FOR OFFICIAL ELECTION MAIL

Sec. 701. Reduced postage rates for official election mail.

TITLE VIII—TRANSITION PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Transfer to Commission of Functions Under Certain Laws

Sec. 801. Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971.
Sec. 802. National Voter Registration Act of 1993.
Sec. 803. Transfer of property, records, and personnel.
Sec. 804. Effective date; transition.

Subtitle B—Coverage of Commission Under Certain Laws and Programs

Sec. 811. Treatment of Commission personnel under certain civil service laws.
Sec. 812. Coverage under Inspector General Act of 1978.

TITLE IX—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 901. State defined.
Sec. 902. Miscellaneous provisions to protect integrity of election process.
Sec. 903. No effect on other laws.

TITLE I—PUNCH CARD VOTING MACHINES

Subtitle A—Replacement of Machines

SEC. 101. ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of General Services (hereafter in this title referred to as the "Administrator") shall establish a program under which the Administrator shall make a one-time payment to each eligible State or unit of local government which used a punch card voting system to administer the regularly scheduled general election for Federal office held in November 2000.

(b) USE OF FUNDS.—A State or unit of local government shall use the funds provided under a payment under this subtitle (either directly or as reimbursement) to replace its punch card voting system with a voting system which does not use punch cards (by purchase, lease, or such other arrangement as may be appropriate).