

One such citizen soldier is Danny Londono. Sergeant Danny Londono gave his life for his country on the streets of Baghdad about 10 days ago, and one such family who must now bear the terrible grief and sadness is Danny's family.

Danny's family lives on East Cottage Street in Dorchester, Massachusetts, a tightly knit, hard-working neighborhood in Boston. Danny was a graduate of Archbishop Williams High School in Braintree, where he was a member of the track team. He enlisted in the Army straight out of high school and did tours as a foot soldier, as paratrooper, and as sergeant with the 82nd Airborne Division; and at age 22, Danny had served in Kosovo and Afghanistan, as well as Iraq.

Sergeant Londono represents the very best this country has to offer. He was someone who hoped to use his skills and training that he got in the Army to make a better life for himself and his family so he could pay for college and possibly return to his community to serve as a police officer. His tour of duty with the Army would have finished in August.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation is enormously proud of Danny Londono. We mourn his loss as we honor his memory. We are all proud of our Armed Forces and the job they are doing today in Iraq, as well as places like Kosovo and Bosnia, Afghanistan, Haiti and elsewhere; but I think it is important that we never lose sight of the individual stories of the soldiers who have given their lives on behalf of this country. For these families, the sacrifice is overwhelming, the sorrow is unspeakable, and the sacrifice is real.

I join with the Members of the House of Representatives in offering our condolences and prayers to Danny Londono and his family.

□ 2000

HELP AMERICA VOTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, following the election debacle in Florida in the 2000 Presidential race, Congress passed the Help America Vote Act to improve election systems across the country; but lately I have met with many election officials who are largely unaware of what that law actually says, and tonight I would like to clarify some of its provisions.

Importantly, HAVA will make money available to the States for new voting machines, but HAVA does not require States and localities to replace systems if they are satisfied with the ones that they have. All those jurisdictions have to do if they want to keep their equipment is just provide voters with instructions how to correct their ballot if they make a mistake before that bal-

lot is cast and counted. So the law that Congress passed permits paper ballots if jurisdictions want to use them, it permits punch cards, it permits lever machines, it permits a central count voting system. Those are not outlawed. Indeed, I am putting in the RECORD tonight title III, section 301 from that act that explains to local election officials what the law actually says. They should not be afraid. There is no Federal pressure to do what they do not want to do.

Some States have decided to go ahead with replacing equipment before this year's Presidential elections even though there are no standards in place at the Federal level to guarantee if they purchase new machines, particularly electronic machines, that they will be secure. And 23 States, including Ohio, have thus received a waiver and are not required to have new systems in place until the first Federal election in 2006, nearly 2 years from now.

There are problems with new electronic voting machines that we did not know when this legislation was initially passed. Some, particularly the primary sponsors of this legislation, say we should leave it alone. They say let the Election Assistance Commission that was talked about in the law do its work. They say let the National Institute of Standards and Technology do its work, let us not have Congress ask any questions right now.

Well, that would be all well and good if those entities had the resources to carry out their job. But the Election Assistance Commission has been formed very late. In fact, a year late. Virtually every deadline that it was given for the issuance of voluntary guidelines to help our local election officials for reports to Congress and for assistance to State and local election authorities has been missed. Today, the commission had its first public meeting, despite the fact it has no permanent office, no equipment it can call its own, no staff beyond the four commissioners and its detailees, and not even enough money to pay for rent for its offices, nor money to pay for the publication tomorrow of State election plans in the Federal Register. It had to depend on the generosity of the General Services Administration for this step required by the Help America Vote Act. Election plans must be published, but the commission has no authority to require changes in them. Public comments will be directed to State election authorities who are free to certify themselves as having met the requirements of HAVA, which essentially at this point has no standards.

So in 45 days with their own certification and no input from the commission, they will begin to receive more than \$2.3 billion to spend with no security standards and no guidance beyond the limited verbiage in the act itself. If this were any other Federal program, how many of our colleagues would be here condemning it? Testing by the National Institute of Standards and Tech-

nology on voting machines and its obligation to help develop tough standards for this new equipment was suspended for 2 months this year because of the lack of Federal money.

The commission is thankful that NIST has been able to identify \$375,000 to help the technical guidance development committee get under way, but it is only getting under way. No recommendations are expected for another 9 months while the commissioners themselves recognize that State and local election authorities are looking for Federal guidelines to help them develop their own standards.

In fact, AP writer Robert Tanner said this weekend, and I will place the entire article in the RECORD, "High-tech voting machines can miscount election results through a software bug or a crashing computer. What is even more troubling, they can be manipulated if someone hacks the computer software. And the biggest problem is without a paper ballot, there is nothing tangible to recount."

To offer some level of guidance, the commission today voted to hold its own hearing on election voting technology within 35 days. I applaud the commission for doing so, but nothing is more important than our right to vote. We must take the time to get this right.

Mr. Speaker, I urge State and local election officials to read my remarks in the RECORD.

ELECTION FIX STYMIED BY DELAYS, COMPUTER DOUBTS, CONFIDENCE GAP

Editors Note—Problems with the election system in Florida left the winner of the 2000 presidential race in doubt for more than a month, and prompted widespread calls to reform the way the nation elects its leaders. Yet nearly four years since George W. Bush won in Florida by 537 votes, reform has been spotty. This story is part of the AP's ongoing coverage of electoral problems across the country.

(By Robert Tanner, AP National Writer)

The discord of Florida 2000 is hard to forget. Angry crowds yelling at local election officials, a paralysis that virtually halted other political work, accusations of a stolen presidential election that echo today.

But the many promises that followed the 36-day stalemate have not produced a nationwide solution to the glaring flaws exposed in the way we cast votes and count them—and another presidential election is just months away.

There's blame enough to go around. Pick any of the following, or all: President Bush and Congress; the voting machine industry; local election officials. (You can add computer scientists, the media, even mistake-prone voters.)

It's true some changes have been made: Roughly 50 million registered voters, or slightly more than a quarter nationwide, will be able to cast ballots on the latest touchscreen equipment this year.

But that leaves the glass half-full, at best, especially with the biggest reforms so far now coming in for criticism. In particular, those ATM-style electronic voting machines—once trumpeted as the solution to voting problems—are now under fire from some computer scientists and lawmakers. That, in turn, is slowing further reforms and weakening confidence in the system even more.

"You have resistance, sort of natural resistance, to change," said Ken Blackwell, Ohio's secretary of state. Legislators in his state, worried about security, want an end to electronic machine purchases, even if punch cards remain in many counties.

In critics' eyes, the problems have been worsened by electoral officials blind to the dangers of a broken system or influenced by political aims, and caring too little about damage done to voters' trust. Others see the slow progress as healthy—that's the way democracies work, they argue, by publicly hashing out problems.

Either way, the bottom line is that another razor-thin presidential election could again leave a victor unclear, a system unable to smoothly resolve the problem, and a skeptical and angry public.

The pitfalls break down into three broad categories: cash, computers and confidence.

After the 2000 crisis, promises of electoral reform didn't translate into quick action. It took nearly two years for Congress to pass the law giving states money and direction to buy new machines, and improve voter registration and training.

The problem was the policy-makers were pulled in different directions—minority and disabled voters sought federal standards to ensure all had equal access to the polls, while state election officials argued local control would best serve widely different communities.

Experts produced nearly a dozen studies, including recommendations from a Gerald Ford-Jimmy Carter commission (some of its top ideas, like making Election Day a holiday and giving all felons the right to vote after serving their sentence, were promptly ignored).

Money for the states to implement reform took even longer: Of \$3.8 billion promised, states have only received \$650 million so far.

The commission that was to be created to dole out money and advice was delayed by arguments between the White House and Congress. Members weren't appointed until December, less than a year before the 2004 election.

"I put the largest blame on Congress itself," said Kim Brace, an elections expert who consults with states. "They built up a lot of hope in the rhetoric side and fell through dramatically on the action side. And certainly on the dollars."

THE DELAYS CONTINUE

Critical technical work on voting machines, tasked to the National Institute of Standards and Technology, was suspended for two months this year because of a lack of federal money. The institute's job? Make sure standards are tough for computerized touchscreen voting machines.

And that leads to the heart of the fight: Critics, including some prominent Democrats, say the ATM-style machines are a bigger danger than punch cards. Source of the infamous "hanging chad" ballots that left Florida election commissioners trying to divine voter intent from bumps on the cards.

Lately, those warnings have been heard: Besides Ohio, officials are reconsidering or delaying the switch to new machines in California, West Virginia, Utah, and more.

"Why trade one imperfect system for another imperfect system?" David Wilde, a councilman in Salt Lake County, asked when questions were raised there about switching to touchscreen machines.

COMPUTER SCIENTISTS' WORRIES RUN MUCH DEEPER

The high-tech voting machines, they say, can miscount election results through a software bug or a crashing computer; what's even more troubling, they can be manipulated if someone hacks the computer's soft-

ware. And the biggest problem is that, without a paper ballot, there is nothing tangible to recount.

Because the voting machine industry keeps its computer code secret, claiming competitive business concerns, no one can be truly confident that the machines are as secure as they promise, critics say.

"If something can be stolen, eventually it will be," said Barbara Simons, a retired IBM computer scientist. "Our democracy is much too valuable to trust them to this machine. . . . If the election is close—or the opinion polls are close—that means people aren't going to trust the outcome. And there's no way to convince them that they are right."

The solution, in this view, are "voter verifiable paper trails"—a paper ballot that the computer prints after a vote is cast, that the voter can see to ensure their choice was accurately recorded, and that will be locked away for any recount.

A number of studies of the electronic machines have confirmed the doubts including a harshly critical one from Johns Hopkins University. Studies in Maryland and Ohio also found flaws, but said they could be corrected.

The divide is deep, however, with exasperated election officials and executives from the voting machine industry arguing that critics are inflating small problems into systemwide dangers and frightening voters unnecessarily.

"I think touchscreen is the best voting system," said Pam Iorio, the former elections supervisor in Florida's Hillsborough County (Tampa), where touchscreens were installed. "Election officials have just not been able to get their message out."

The paper trail proposed would "do more harm than good," said Dawn Williams, who oversees elections in Marshall County, Iowa. The receipts will just confuse voters, add more equipment to break down and more burdens for poll workers.

Primary elections so far this year have produced small glitches—machines that failed to boot up in San Diego, coding problems in Georgia and Maryland—but no outright disasters. Supporters of the new technology say that proves the wisdom of their confidence; doubters say it shows nothing of the sort.

The suspicion of critics is compounded by the fact that election officials and the voting machine industry are often closely intertwined.

Washington state's secretary of state went to work in the industry; so did several election officials in California. Under scrutiny is a job change in California, when the former state official in charge of evaluating voting machines took a top job with Election Systems and Software, a large manufacturer.

Those in the relatively small world of elections say that's natural.

"I personally don't see anything wrong with it," said Ernie Hawkins, who retired last year as head of Sacramento's election division. "You know the business, you know the problem, you know where the dangers are. I'd probably be more inclined to listen to someone who was trying to sell me something if they knew what they were talking about."

And don't leave out the politics. The chief executive of Ohio-based Diebold Inc., one of the largest voting machine manufacturers and a top target of security critics, is a top fund-raiser for the Bush campaign. In an August fund-raising letter, Walden O'Dell sought \$10,000 donations and declared he was "committed to helping Ohio deliver its electoral votes to the president next year."

He later announced that he would "try to be more sensitive" and would lower his political profile.

While errors are inevitable in a system recording tens of millions of votes nationally, it's clear that scrutiny of the voting system will be at an all-time high this year. A greater-than-usual number of election officials have quit or taken retirement. Others are just hoping for a presidential blowout.

"Every election official's prayer is, you hear many times, they really don't care who wins," said Richard Smolka, an elections expert and retired political science professor. "They just don't want the election to be that close."

TITLE III—UNIFORM AND NONDISCRIMINATORY ELECTION TECHNOLOGY AND ADMINISTRATION REQUIREMENTS

Subtitle A—Requirements

SEC. 301. VOTING SYSTEMS STANDARDS.

(a) REQUIREMENTS.—Each voting system used in an election for Federal office shall meet the following requirements:

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the voting system (including any lever voting system, optical scanning voting system, or direct recording electronic system) shall—

(i) permit the voter to verify (in a private and independent manner) the votes selected by the voter on the ballot before the ballot is cast and counted;

(ii) provide the voter with the opportunity (in a private and independent manner) to change the ballot or correct any error before the ballot is cast and counted (including the opportunity to correct the error through the issuance of a replacement ballot if the voter was otherwise unable to change the ballot or correct any error); and

(iii) if the voter selects votes for more than one candidate for a single office—

(I) notify the voter that the voter has selected more than one candidate for a single office on the ballot;

(II) notify the voter before the ballot is cast and counted of the effect of casting multiple votes for the office; and

(III) provide the voter with the opportunity to correct the ballot before the ballot is cast and counted.

(B) A State or jurisdiction that uses a paper ballot voting system, a punch card voting system, or a central count voting system (including mail-in absentee ballots and mail-in ballots), may meet the requirements of subparagraph (A)(iii) by—

(i) establishing a voter education program specific to that voting system that notifies each voter of the effect of casting multiple votes for an office; and

(ii) providing the voter with instructions on how to correct the ballot before it is cast and counted (including instructions on how to correct the error through the issuance of a replacement ballot if the voter was otherwise unable to change the ballot or correct any error).

(C) The voting system shall ensure that any notification required under this paragraph preserves the privacy of the voter and the confidentiality of the ballot.

(2) AUDIT CAPACITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The voting system shall produce a record with an audit capacity for such system.

(B) MANUAL AUDIT CAPACITY.—

(i) The voting system shall produce a permanent paper record with a manual audit capacity for such system.

(ii) The voting system shall provide the voter with an opportunity to change the ballot or correct any error before the permanent paper record is produced.

(iii) The paper record produced under subparagraph (A) shall be available as an official record for any recount conducted with respect to any election in which the system is used.

HOUSE TO DEBATE BUDGET
RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for yielding me this time. In the 2000 Presidential election, President Bush declared that he was against nation building. Who knew it was America he was talking about? President Kennedy used to say, to govern is to choose, and how we make our choices in this budget is a reflection of our values and the choices we want to make for the American people. It is not just a set of numbers; it is a set of priorities, a set of values, a set of principles.

I put together an analysis of what the President has done here in America with his budget and what he is doing in Iraq with the American taxpayers' money. Take job training, for instance. In the United States, although we have cut \$316 million in vocational education, in Iraq, \$60 million for demobilizing and job training for 130,000 enemy combatants. Funding is \$353 million for American enterprise fund and job training. \$151 million has been cut in adult training here in the United States. Those are values; those are priorities.

Take the area of college education. Here in the United States we have cut \$101 million in the President's budget for Perkins loans; \$327 million has been cut in Pell grants for college education. In Iraq, \$20 million for higher education and development projects creating U.S.-Iraqi university partnerships.

Expanding literacy, we have cut reading programs here in the United States; \$40 million for building 275 schools and training 10,000 teachers in Iraq. That is just one example of the set of priorities and values that the President's budget reflects here at home.

My view is, I am for investing in Iraq's future, giving the children of Iraq a future, but not one that is less promising and less strong and less valuable than the one we have here for the people in the United States. We should not invest in Iraq for things we are not willing to invest for here in the United States.

Take the issue of health care. Americans are facing a huge health care crisis. Costs are growing by 20 percent a year for the last 3 years and are expected to grow like that going forward. What have we done since the President got elected? We used to have 38 million uninsured in America, today we have 43 million uninsured, and not a single proposal to deal with it.

In the President's budget, we cut \$278 million for health professional train-

ing. In Iraq, we fund free training for 2,200 health professionals and 8,000 volunteers.

There has been a \$94 million cut to community access programs to coordinate health care services to underinsured. In Iraq, \$793 million has been spent for health care construction and medical equipment. \$78 million in the United States is cut for health activities to provide health care for rural America; \$28 million is provided for operation and staffing of 150 health clinics for 3 million Iraqis.

Down here, funding has been cut for all child care programs here in the United States; \$44 million is provided for community development projects in Iraq for child care facilities. Those are our values; those are our priorities. Why is Congress willing to fund Iraq's health care professionals, why are we investing American money for 2,200 new health care professionals, yet here in the President's budget we cut health professional training not just by \$78 million. That is a 64 percent cut in that budget.

What is it about the Iraqi health care system that we can see an investment that will reap the benefits of a stronger, healthier Iraqi population; but here at home, we say to rural America and community health care, we say to control cost, we are going to cut and slash. Those are our values; those are our priorities. These budgets are not numbers. They reflect what we care about and what we envision. We cannot have a vision for Iraq that is stronger and better than the one that we envision for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, that is just in the area of health care. In the Corps of Engineers, in Iraq we have opened up a new port for commerce. In the United States, the Corps of Engineers, we have a 10 percent cut in their budget, in the President's budget. We are investing \$4 billion to open up a new port in Iraq, and we are cutting the Corps of Engineers here in the United States that helps economic growth and the movement of goods and services.

That budget for Iraq reflects our values, and that budget for America reflects our values. These are not our values at work. We can have differences among our parties; but ultimately the budget has to reflect what we think and how we see America growing, how we see our children getting educated, how we see our workers getting trained, and how we see the health care for our communities.

We cannot invest in Iraq in a way that envisions they have a brighter future than the one we are envisioning for our own families. As we hear from my colleagues this evening about the budget choices we make, there are other areas we are going to be talking about on education, job training, health care, commerce, the environment.

We have a policy for the marshes to be restored in Iraq, yet we are cutting the Environmental Protection Agency

in the United States. We have a \$4 billion water program going on in Iraq, yet for our drinking water facility we have cut \$300 million here at home. Those are not our values; those are not our priorities.

So when the President declared in 2000 when he was running for the Presidency that he was against nation building, he was right; but who knew it was the United States he was talking about. But think of the upside: in 2004 when President Bush seeks reelection, he can at least say he kept his commitment, that he was against nation building because the end result of his economic policies, the end result of his budgets, 9 million uninsured Americas, 2.7 million Americans who had jobs since he became President lost their jobs, 43 million Americans have no health care, 33 million Americans work full time without health care, 2 million additional children who used to be part of the middle class are now in poverty, and a trillion dollars' worth of corporate assets have been foreclosed on.

As Ronald Reagan once said, facts are a stubborn thing. Those are the facts, and those are the results of the President's economic priorities. This is his fourth budget since being President. He has made an investment in Iraq that he has not measured up and made here in the United States. We must have the priorities that we hold for Iraq to be true for the United States. That is what this debate and this discussion about the budget is.

Mr. Speaker, I thank again the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for allowing me this opportunity to lay out some of the choices that I went through on the budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) for his contribution.

The gentleman was talking about the budget. The reason the budget is topical is tomorrow the House takes up what we call the budget resolution. It is a tough task that lies before us tomorrow. The budget resolution is just an outline. This is it right here. I have the Democratic substitute to it. It is about 67 pages double-spaced. So why is it so tough? It is tough because the deficit this year is \$521 billion. This year, 1 year, the deficit is \$521 billion.

□ 2015

The budget is in deficit over the next 10 years by at least two to three times that amount, by at least \$4 trillion on top of that amount. That is one reason the task is tough.

It is also tough because we did not have to be here. We did not have to be in this situation. Three years ago when President Bush took office, he gained a benefit that no President in recent history has enjoyed. He gained a budget which he inherited in surplus, big-time surplus, by more than \$100 billion. The previous year, the year 2000, the surplus was \$236 billion. We actually paid off debt of the United States in 1999, 2000 and 2001. That was the context in which Mr. Bush came to office.