

This bottom blue represents how much of the total Social Security benefits will be accommodated by that interest savings. You still end up with a shortfall of \$35 trillion. The biggest risk, I am convinced, is doing nothing at all. Social Security has a total funded liability of over \$9 trillion that I mentioned; that \$9 trillion of unfunded liability today can be expressed in terms of \$120 trillion in tomorrow's dollars. In the next 75 years' dollars, that is going to be—that amount is going to be short of what is needed to pay benefits over and above what comes in in Social Security taxes.

The Social Security trust funds contain nothing but IOUs to keep paying promised Social Security benefits. The payroll tax will have to be increased by nearly 50 percent, or benefits will have to be cut by 30 percent. Neither of those options is acceptable. Certainly a tax increase should not be acceptable.

But let me briefly review, Mr. Speaker, what we have done on increasing the Social Security taxes over the last 60 years.

□ 2000

In 1940, the Social Security tax was 2 percent; 1 percent for the employee, 1 percent for the employer. It was on the first \$3,000 of income, maximum tax. Employee and employer combined was \$60. In 1960, we increased the tax to 6 percent, increased the base to \$4,800. Again \$288 a year was the total of employee-employer taxes on Social Security. 1980, it went up to 10.16 percent on \$25,900. Today after the 1993 changes, it has now developed into a 12.4 percent tax on the first \$76,200 of payroll. What do we do? That brings it to almost \$9,500 per year. If we let this go, then we are asking so much of young workers, of our kids and our grandkids, to pay this exceptional tax.

I am a farmer from Michigan. I grew up with the idea that one tries to pay off the farm mortgage to leave one's kids a little better chance. But this body, this body and this Congress gets so, I think, wrapped up in the importance of spending today that we think taking money from them and leaving them an extra high mortgage justifies the kind of standard of living that we want and the kind of things that this body and the body down at the other end of the Capitol, the Senate, and the President want to spend money on. That is what we are arguing about now on finishing off this year's budget, can we reduce the increase in spending.

Personal retirement accounts, let me talk about what would one do if one had some individual investments. What is compound interest? Compound interest means that, if one can invest one's money, one gets extra interest on it. It makes that fund larger. Then the interest on that extra amount of money that can grow, it can make an average worker a rich retiree.

If John Doe makes an average of \$36,000 a year, and they are allowed to invest 4 percent of their Social Secu-

rity tax in a private account, then instead of getting the \$1,280 a year from Social Security, they would be receiving \$6,514 a month from that kind of a personal retirement account.

When they passed the Social Security law in 1934, they said it is an option whether counties and States want to opt into the Social Security system or have their own retirement program. Galveston County, Texas opted to have their own personal investment. Let just take a look at what is happening there.

Death benefits under Social Security, \$253; in Galveston, \$75,000. Disability benefits, \$1,280 under Social Security; the Galveston plan, \$2,749. The retirement benefits, Social Security, \$1,280, same as disability. The Galveston plan for retirement is \$4,790 a month. Private investments and the magic of compound interest have to be part of what is going to keep this system solvent.

Personal retirement accounts, they do not come out of social security, they become part of one's Social Security retirement benefits. A worker will own his or her retirement account. It is limited to safe investments. It certainly can earn more than the 1.9 percent interest that an average retiree today is getting from Social Security. That is going to be much lower in the future.

San Diego is another area that has opted out of Social Security into a personal retirement account system. A 30-year-old employee there who earns a salary of \$30,000 for 35 years and contributes 6 percent into his PRA would receive \$3,000 per month in retirement; and, under the current system, he would contribute twice as much, but receive only \$1,077 from Social Security.

Let me conclude by quickly running through these and making a comment. The U.S. trails other countries in saving its retirement system. Other socialized countries are moving into the private personal retirement accounts faster than the United States.

I represented the United States at a worldwide meeting on Social Security over in London 3 years ago. I was so surprised to see so many of the other countries that were so far ahead of us in getting such a much larger return and having success in keeping their public retirement pension solvent.

In the 18 years since Chile offered the PRAs, 95 percent of Chilean workers have received accounts. Their average rate of return has been 11.3 percent per year. Other countries, Australia, Britain, Switzerland all offer workers their own personal retirement accounts.

The British workers chose PRAs overwhelmingly for their top tier. So even from England, the socialized country, they moved into their own personal retirement accounts.

There are several ways we can do this. Some of the Democrats have expressed concern that the stock market is too risky. But one can decide what

the balance is, whether it is 30 or 40 percent into bonds and 60 or 70 percent into equities. One can limit the equities to indexed stocks, indexed global funds, an index that is going to be across the board.

Over the years, the average for any 30-year period, if one starts working at age 20 and finished working at age 50, for a 30-year period, for the last 100 years, the average return on equity investments is 6.7 percent.

This is just sort of repeating myself a little bit. But based on a family income of \$58,400 some, the return on a PRA is even better. If one invests 2 percent, as the blue; if one invests 6 percent, as the pink; and the purple is if one had invested 10 percent of one's income. But over 30 years, one would end up with almost \$1 million. But over 40 years, it would be \$1,000,389 if one worked for 40 years paying in 10 percent, being allowed to take 10 percent into one's private investments.

If I have one final message, certainly it would be that everybody has to make a greater effort, savings and investing; that Social Security cannot be one's total retirement account.

In our Social Security tax force, we had testimony that, within the next 25 years, people would have the option of living to be 100 years old if they wanted to. That not only offers a tremendous challenge to government run programs and their future solvency, but it emphasizes the need to move out of a fixed benefit program, at least partially, at least to some extent, and have a fixed contribution. But it also says that every individual today needs to make a more aggressive effort to save and invest. That is why this Chamber has decided to encourage savings and investment.

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALDEN of Oregon). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) is recognized for 37 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, suddenly 37 minutes became available, and I thought I would come to this floor and address the issue that is on the minds of everyone in this country. I invite those of my colleagues who have a like mind to come down and share this 37 minutes with me. I have been joined by one of our colleagues from the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), who I will yield to after I deal with the first and second points.

The first point I want to make is that Vice President GORE did win the popular vote by well over 200,000 votes. Now, I know the point is often made that there are several hundred thousand votes still waiting to be counted in California. Well, I am from California as well as the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN). California

was won overwhelmingly by the Gore candidacy, and we know from our experience that that means that, if anything, the late absentee ballots, those counted because they were received virtually on election day, will, if anything, bolster this 216,000 vote lead.

Likewise, there are some uncounted votes in the State of Washington, mostly from the Puget Sound region, which Vice President GORE won overwhelmingly. So when the votes are cast, it will be clear what the popular vote is in America.

The American voters voted for AL GORE and JOE LIEBERMAN by a plurality of roughly a quarter million. But what is before us is the electoral college. The electoral college requires us, as a matter of law, to put aside that quarter million vote majority for AL GORE and, instead, focus on this on a State-by-State basis.

Now, there has been an attempt by Governor Bush to try to use political insult, if not political intimidation, for those of us who respect the rule of law and want that rule of law to go forward, those who want the courts to act as referees just as we have referees in football. I know some would argue it would be a more exciting game of football if we took the referees off the field, but if one believes in the rules, one has got to believe in the refs.

Now, Florida seems to turn first and foremost on the vote in Palm Beach County. If we are to have an accurate electoral college vote, we need to focus on the ballots in Palm Beach County. We will see that there is a very strong argument for a revote in that county.

The ballot which I am about to show my colleagues is acknowledged by virtually everyone to be very confusing. It did, in fact, confuse tens of thousands of voters in Palm Beach County. There were some 19,000 voters in that county who double punched, voted for two presidential candidates.

The Bush campaign has argued that is roughly analogous to a somewhat lower number, perhaps 14,000, who they say double punched in 1996. The only problem is that is a false number. It is not fuzzy math, it is false math. The figure that they use in 1996 is the sum of those who just skipped the Presidential race, did not want to vote for any of the Presidential candidates, and those in Palm Beach County in 1996 who mistakenly punched two holes.

In fact, the number of who punched two holes this time was roughly double the number who punched two holes in the prior election. That is because of the famous butterfly ballot which confused voters. Not only were they confused into voting twice, but they were confused into voting for Pat Buchanan. Pat Buchanan has admitted that many of the votes he received in Palm Beach County were not voters who wanted to vote for Pat Buchanan. If Pat Buchanan can admit that, why cannot Governor Bush?

But it is not enough that the ballot is confusing. The ballot is also in viola-

tion of Florida law in two important respects, both of which contributed to voters not being allowed to vote.

First, Florida law requires that the names be on the left and the holes be to the right of the name. If this ballot had been done legally, prepared legally, prepared according to Florida State statutes, we would not have this problem. These folks would be listed below the other folks. There would be one hole next to each name, and people would punch. That is not what happened. It was a ballot designed in violation of Florida law.

Second, the ballot laws of Florida require that the candidate be in a certain order. The party that won the governorship in Florida, the Republican Party, is entitled to go first. The party that came in second for the governorship, the Democratic Party, is entitled to go second. But if one pushes the second hole, one's vote is not counted for the Democratic Party. The second hole does not belong to the Democratic Party. The second hole belongs to the Reform Party. So one has a situation where the order of the holes is not as specified by Florida law. Those two problems, two violations of law led to the confusion.

Now, Florida law on this was announced just 2 years ago. In the 1990 Supreme Court case, in the Supreme Court of California, Bextrum versus Volusia County Canvassing Board in which the court finds substantial non-compliance with statutory election procedures. If the court makes a factual determination that reasonable doubt exists as to whether a certified election expressed the will of the voters, then the court is to void the contested election, even in the absence of fraud or intentional wrongdoing.

□ 2015

The court, the Supreme Court of Florida, has spoken to this very situation. We certainly have a situation where doubt exists as to what is the right outcome; there are more people gathered in our cloakroom some of the times than the total number of votes separating the two candidates in Florida; and substantial noncompliance with statutory election procedures was operative. So clearly, under Florida law, the court, in the standards it adopted in 1998, should order a revote in Palm Beach County.

I want to point out that it is premature for us to call for that here and now. No candidate for President has yet called for a revote in Palm Beach County. I think, however, the argument presented here would be a strong one to result in such a revote.

I should point out that there are other elements of this confusion. The first is reported in The Washington Post of this past Saturday where they reported that confused voters were besieging the county commissioners by telephone in the morning. By the afternoon, they were calling local radio shows. Then there was a hastily writ-

ten memo from a county supervisor of elections distributed at the end, when most people had already voted, trying to explain the inexplicable. And, in fact, one senior leader, the president of the Century Village Retirement Community, said people were crying. They were coming to us to ask questions; the ballot was lousy; they did not know who they voted for.

I can go on and on with the discussion of the confusion and the sorrow, the anger and the frustration of the people of Palm Beach County as they were denied their right to vote by a ballot that violated the statutes of the State of Florida. But at this point, I know that I have two very patient colleagues, the first one serving on the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), who I know also wants to address these issues.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I just want to speak briefly on the issue of the recount.

It is true that I am a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and formerly taught at a law school and practiced law and the like, but I would like to speak this evening more as just a neighbor and a person who has just come to the Nation's capital from California fresh with the insights from the people who are in my neighborhood who say this: we are not in a crisis. We all wish this were over. We want it to be done. But we also know that we can be patient and get an accurate count.

I think it is time for all of us in America to ask everyone in the leadership of both parties to put patriotism ahead of partisanship. Now, it is true all of us had a favorite candidate. I hoped that AL GORE would be elected President, and some of my neighbors hoped that George Bush would be elected President. The truth is we do not know which of them will be elected. But we need to put our desire for our candidate to win to one side in favor of democratic processes. We need to make sure that the vote is counted accurately and that whatever happens reflects the will of the American people.

Now, I heard some rhetoric this evening that I found disturbing, in all honesty. It seemed to indicate or to infer that somehow because there was a hand count that there was something unsavory; that there would be something wrong or backhanded about this. But we know that these recounts are going on in a fish bowl. We have hundreds of people watching every single ballot; designated people from both parties. We have CNN, CBS, NBC, ABC, and the Fox News channel. It is a veritable convention looking at each ballot. It is very clear that there is nothing sneaky that is going to go on in these recounts. In fact, we will have the most accurate count possible.

Before I was in Congress, I was in local government for 14 years. I was on the board of supervisors, and we were in charge of elections. Elections are

never perfect. Poll workers show up late, ballots get shredded, problems can occur. We know that that is true. But when elections are this close, recounts always occur. And we always, when I was in local government, we always respected that those recounts needed to occur so that the people's will could, in the end, rule the day.

When the recount will decide who will be the leader of the free world, of course we need, as the American people, to exhibit patience, and we have time for that patience to play out. We have a President. He will be President until January 20. So we certainly have time to make sure that all the votes get counted.

America has confidence that the current President of the United States, whether we support him or do not support him, was elected in a way that reflected the Constitution and the rules; and we need to make sure that the next President, whoever he is, has that same confidence on the part of the American people. That is why it is important for the partisans in this discussion to just back off, just back off and let the vote and the counting of the vote take place. If it is necessary, hand recount all of the votes in Florida. That would be fine.

Let us make sure that the people's will is reflected in the electoral college; and then all of us can live with the result, whatever it is. However disappointed we might be, whether it is our candidate or the other side, the American tradition is to allow the transition of power to proceed smoothly and to celebrate the fact that we are a violence-free democracy that understands that our institutions are more important than any election. So, please, let us, all of us, back off and put our patriotism ahead of our partisanship.

I thank the gentleman from California for yielding for these few comments.

Mr. SHERMAN. I thank the gentlewoman from California for her comments. I yield now to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my two colleagues from California. I do not intend to use a lot of time, but I just wanted to say that I totally agree with what the gentlewoman has said.

It disturbed me a great deal, to be honest, when I heard some of our colleagues from the other side of the aisle come here earlier this evening and sort of deride the process. I think at one point one of our colleagues from the Republican side suggested that the campaign manager for the Democrats was involved in fraud or that his father was involved in fraud. These kinds of comments are totally inappropriate. I do not even know if they are allowed under the rules of the House.

As the gentlewoman said, let us not get into this partisan argument and start calling names tonight. All the gentleman from California is saying,

from what I understand, and I respect the gentleman a great deal for it, is that he just wants the will of the people to be heard. The gentleman just wants to make sure that if somebody voted, or intended to vote a certain way, that they be counted; that their sacred right to vote, which we cherish under our form of government, not be taken from them.

I just want to make two comments in that regard. One is that, again, it upset me today to think that the Republicans had gone into court to stop the recount. We know that these manual recounts occur from time to time and are necessary from time to time. I was actually involved with one myself going back almost 20 years. I think it was in 1981, when we had a very close gubernatorial race. I had to sit in a room and watch and see whether those, we called them chits in New Jersey, I guess they call them chads in Florida, to see whether they were actually punctured and the votes were counted. Ultimately it did not make that much of a difference in terms of the total vote count; but at least people were assured that someone was looking carefully, and in this case a number of people looking carefully, to make sure that their vote counted and their intention to vote a certain way was carried forth.

I feel the same way about this whole manual recount, and the gentleman's suggestion there about how this ballot was set up. I do not know whether this will end up in court or not; but it really pains me to think that anyone, whether they be Republican, as some of them earlier, a Democrat or anybody, would suggest that the will of the people should not be carried forth.

I think there is a real philosophical difference here. I heard some of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle saying, well, people have to be very careful when they go into vote; treat it as a solemn occasion and do not get it wrong. It is as if someone gets it wrong, that is their own problem; that is their fault; they have to carry the personal responsibility of having gotten it wrong. Well, the bottom line is that if the ballot is set up in a way to confuse and it is obvious the intent was to vote for a certain candidate and the vote was discarded, it seems to me it is incumbent upon us to make sure that that vote counts; whether there is a manual recount to check to see whether the chit was punctured or whether a new vote has to occur to make sure the people whose ballots were thrown out get an opportunity to vote. It just seems to me that what we want is for the people to be able to exercise their right to vote.

Mr. SHERMAN. If I can interject at this point.

Mr. PALLONE. Certainly. I would certainly yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. SHERMAN. Even those who say it is up to the voter to know the law, and if the voter gets it wrong, we will discard the voter's vote even if it is ap-

parent how that voter voted, even those folks have got to admit the ballot was designed in violation of law. And if we are going to tell voters they are responsible for knowing the law, they have a right to a ballot designed in accordance with the law.

The law in Florida states if someone punches the second hole that they are voting for the party that came in second in the last gubernatorial election. Only on that ballot it is not designed that way. So it is simply wrong to be tough on the voters while forcing the voter not to be able to rely on the statutes of the State in which they reside.

Mr. PALLONE. I agree. And if the gentleman would just yield to me once more, very briefly, I strongly believe that we have to do whatever we can to make sure that a person's vote counts. If we do not, then what is going to happen is people are going to say why should I bother to vote.

The bottom line is that last Tuesday was a great day because so many people came out to vote. I know in my own district, in my own State of New Jersey, there was an overwhelming turnout. It was grand to see so many people come out because they thought it was going to be a close election, and it was, and they knew their vote would count. So let us not let them down by saying that their vote does not count, or something is done to make sure that their vote does not count. Because that will certainly discourage people from voting in the future, and I certainly do not want that to happen.

And, lastly, I would say this. Let us not make this a partisan process. I have to say that I am very partisan, as the gentleman knows, when I come to the floor of the House and I talk about issues. But this is not a question of an issue or a bill; this is a question of our democracy and upholding the Constitution. I would just expect that both sides of the aisle would simply not make this into a partisan battle. One may feel the votes should count or not count, or they may feel strongly about how people should exercise their right to vote; but let us not start the name calling, the way I heard before, against the candidates or against the parties or against the representatives. I do not really believe anybody wants that, and we should refrain from that. I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. SHERMAN. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for the tenor of his remarks, and I would join him in saying that perhaps the lowest point of the television debates and back and forths have been when there has been an attack made on the campaign chairman for the Gore campaign because of his father. I have never seen my father's integrity attacked on this floor; I have never seen the integrity of the father of the gentleman from New Jersey attacked on this floor; and I have certainly never heard of an attack on a Member's integrity for the purpose of discrediting his arguments on a bill. That behavior is certainly lower than

this House has ever gone and, hopefully, the Bush campaign will not descend to those levels again.

□ 2030

Mr. Speaker, I would like to continue to talk about how people reacted to that confusing and illegal ballot in Palm Beach, Florida. One elderly voter did the right thing. That voter asked for a second ballot, having ruined his first ballot. Bernard Holtzer, a retired community inhabitant, said he had unintentionally voted for Pat Buchanan on the first ballot and the clerk refused his request for a second ballot. Holtzer said, "I told the clerk I made a boo-boo and that I wanted a new ballot. And she told me there was nothing she could do about it."

That is the New York Times, this Saturday, reporting that not only was the ballot confusing and illegal but that the county workers did not in any way allow for the appropriate legal remedy. In fact, that same New York Times article points out that poll workers were under strict instructions to turn away voters who came to them with questions. Quoting one poll worker named Louise Austin, Ms. Austin said, "I had to follow the directive, 'Don't help anyone. Don't talk to anyone.'" Again, the New York Times reports that.

So there were as reported in both the New York Times and the Washington Post precinct workers who received instructions very late in the day telling them how to help confused voters. Of course that begs the question, what about the well over 75 percent of the voters who voted before those instructions went out to the poll workers?

So we have reason to believe that the only way that the people of Palm Beach County will be allowed to vote in this election, will have their franchise protected, is if there is a revote in Palm Beach County. Now, I know that is controversial and that is even a conclusion that I am not ready to fully embrace here tonight, because it is a premature conclusion. Because there is something that we all agree on, and, that is, the first step is a proper count of all the ballots that were cast. And a proper count is the best possible count. A manual recount is the best possible count.

First, it is argued we should not have a manual recount because somehow that is the second recount. You cannot recount after a recount. Well, let us straighten that out. This manual recount is the first recount requested by the Gore campaign. Because the election was so close, there was an automatic recount by machine in every county. But that was not at the request of the Gore campaign because the Gore campaign appears to want the most accurate possible recount. And so the Gore campaign has made only one recount request, and that is for a manual recount to be conducted in four counties. The Gore campaign never asked for a machine recount. And to

say that the most accurate recount should be ignored because there was a worse system employed not at the request of any candidate is absurd.

Now, why is it that I say that a manual recount is the better recount? Well, we are told by James Baker that he prefers a recount using precision machines. These precision machines, 1950s technology, machines that cannot read a bent card, machines that jam up when you put a bent card in them, machines that cannot tell you what their standards are. Where there has been argument about whether a particular punch card should be counted, a swinging door chad, a partially detached chad, what are the machine's standards? We do not know. The engineers of the machines do not know. Sometimes the machine will count a bent ballot. Sometimes it will not. Sometimes if it is partially punched, the machine counts it. Sometimes it will not. The machine is not talking to anybody and nobody can look inside it while it is counting. It is not the same as having three citizens in full view, viewed by Republican and Democratic experts behind them, on cable television, counting the ballots one at a time.

Those who refer to precision machines are wrong, because the invention of man is indeed imperfect, far more imperfect than the creation of God. A human being watched and consulting other human beings, in full public, can look at a bent card, can look at a partially attached chad, can apply specific standards and can reach the correct conclusion. That is why in Seminole County, Florida, last week, they did a manual count, much to the glee of the Bush campaign which got 100 extra votes as a result of the manual count done after the machine count, the machine recount. Bush husbands and enjoys that 100 votes. In fact, it is a third of the lead he claims today. And it is all because in a Republican county they completed a manual recount.

To be detailed, what happened was if a card would not go through the machine, they would look at it, determine the vote of the voter, create a new ballot reflecting that intent, and run it through the Seminole County machine. That is a manual recount in Seminole County. Yet no one in the Bush campaign has asked for those 100 extra votes to be subtracted from their column.

But we do not have to look just at what is happening in Florida. We know by looking at Texas. Here is the statute, signed into law by Governor Bush, scarcely 3 years ago: a manual recount shall be conducted in preference to an electronic recount. How dare James Baker insult the Governor of Texas when he says that these words are wrong. Now, Mr. Baker says they have standards in Texas. They have, of course, standards in Florida as well. In each county in Florida, the election board identifies swinging door chads, partially attached chads; and the train-

ing is going on right now and yesterday so that each poll worker follows those instructions. Machines, of course, have no standards at all; but the poll workers in Florida, county by county, do.

But if James Baker and the Bush campaign think the problem is standards, why do they go to court to try to prevent an accurate recount? They should be coming to the election officials in Florida and suggesting standards. If there are wonderful standards available, proven, used in Texas, why does the Governor of Texas not share them with the people of Florida? The fact of the matter is there are not really specific standards in Texas that are any better than those in Florida. The Florida standards are just fine. The Bush campaign is not looking for a manual vote based on uniform standards. They are looking for a quick victory that ignores the will of the Florida voters. They are looking to stop the manual vote, not improve it.

That is why they went to court today and they asked a Federal judge. They would be the first to insult judges and the first to seek a court injunction and the first to be turned down by the courts. And they tried to get a Federal judge to prevent what the Texas Governor in his own State and his own statutes recognized as the most accurate method of recount. They failed. But justice may still not prevail, because the Secretary of State of Florida, herself the cochair of the Bush campaign, has to come up with this idea that all the counting has to be done by 5 p.m. tomorrow.

Now, is this based on Florida statute? No. It is based on a misreading of Florida statute. She cites section 102.111 which sets a 5 p.m. deadline. But a more recent Florida statute is in clear conflict with 111 and that is section 102.112, passed more recently, under our laws entitled to greater weight when there is direct conflict. It says, if the election returns are not received by the department by the time specified, such returns may be ignored.

So the Secretary of State, the cochair of the Bush campaign, has merely the discretion, if she wants to, to disenfranchise entire counties in Florida because they want to do an accurate recount. No court should allow such discretion to be used arbitrarily and no campaign should want its candidate for President to win because of such arbitrary and wrongful action. Who could deny this country an accurate recount by the methods signed into law in his own State by the Governor of Texas?

But it goes beyond that. Here, on a smaller chart, I have listed four Republican congressional candidates, each of whom wanted a manual recount. Each of them got a manual recount. Whether it was John Ensign running for the Senate 2 years ago or the famous Bob Dornan case, or whether it was Peter Torkildsen in 1996 or Rick McIntyre in 1984. In 1984, Rick McIntyre demanded and got a manual recount. And Dick Cheney was on this floor saying he

would go to war over that request. The request was granted. I realize there were other controversies about that race. But Dick Cheney, when he was here, was here backing up Rick McIntyre's demand for a manual recount.

So of course there should be a manual recount. And of course attempts to say that it has to be done by 5 p.m. tomorrow are outrageous.

I will tell you how outrageous they are. Tonight, I hope, in several counties in Florida, people are going to be doing the manual recount all through the night. They are going to get tired. And James Baker is going to be on television saying, "Oh, my God, it can't be accurate. They were tired. They must be ignored." Why are they tired? Why are they working through the night? Because the Bush campaign wants to impose a ridiculous 5 p.m. deadline. Now, is this 5 p.m. deadline there to assure that the election is decided more quickly? No. There can be no decision in Florida until 5 p.m. Friday when those overseas ballots have to have arrived in Florida to be counted. So why 5 p.m. Tuesday as a deadline for completing a manual recount? Only one reason, to frustrate the manual recount, to make people be tired during the manual recount, to ridicule the manual recount. A manual recount, which is the method of choice in the State of Texas, because Governor Bush signed the law that made it so because he was right.

We have seen that the creation of God does a better job in this case than the invention of man and that human beings can do better. So it would be nice if the Governor was trying to get the most accurate recount instead of trying to slam the door on the most accurate recount.

Let me deal with one other issue. The Bush campaign says that what is unfair is that the media at around 7:40 p.m. or 6:40 p.m., anyway, 20 minutes before the polls were going to close in the Florida panhandle, called the Florida race. What the media did was inaccurate. They gave voters in the Florida panhandle inaccurate information. But is that the only stupid and inaccurate information to appear on television in this electoral season? The voters have a right under Florida law, under the U.S. Constitution, to vote and to have their will at the polls expressed. That is very different from saying that you have a constitutional right not to get bad information in the press, because I assure you there is no such right to get only accurate information in the press. We get inaccurate information in the press all the time, and the press has called Florida four or five different times. Every time they have called it wrong.

Mr. Speaker, to summarize, the popular vote will go overwhelmingly for AL GORE, the Vice President, and JOE LIEBERMAN, the Senator from Connecticut.

□ 2045

The ballot in Palm Beach County was responsible for twisting these results, which clearly possibly affected the results and was an illegal as well as a confusing ballot, a ballot in violation of two different Florida statutes, well-designed statutes, that were not carried out; and the Florida courts have recognized that where there is confusion because of a violation of the Florida elections code, a revote is called for. But before we get to a revote, we need to do everything possible to get an accurate count of the vote cast on election night; and that vote can best be recounted, as George Bush's signature indicates when he signed this bill, can best be recounted by a manual recount, the only recount requested by the Gore campaign, the only method that is recognized by the Governor of Texas as the most accurate way to do the recount.

Now, there are criticisms of what the standards are that are being used in the manual recount. Those who criticize have an obligation to make suggestions. They do not have the right to say that because they do not find perfection in the best and preferred method, that because they do not find it perfect, that it should be ignored.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DEUTSCH (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of business in the district.

Mr. McNULTY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of an airplane cancellation.

Mr. JEFFERSON (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. HEFLEY (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MICA) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes, today and November 14.

Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today and November 14.

Mr. MICA, for 5 minutes, today.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported

that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On October 31, 2000:

H.J. Res. 121. Making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes.

On November 1, 2000:

H.R. 4864. To amend title 38, United States Code, to reaffirm and clarify the duty of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to assist claimants for benefits under laws administered by the Secretary, and for other purposes.

H.R. 782. To amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to extend authorizations of appropriations for programs under the Act, to modernize programs and services for older individuals, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2498. To amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for recommendations of the Secretary of Health and Human Services regarding the placement of automatic external defibrillators in Federal buildings in order to improve survival rates of individuals who experience cardiac arrest in such buildings, and to establish protections from civil liability arising from the emergency use of the devices.

H.R. 4788. To amend the United States Grain Standards Act to extend the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to collect fees to cover the cost of services performed under that Act, extend the authorization of appropriations for that Act, and improve the administration of that Act, to reenact the United States Warehouse Act to require the licensing and inspection of warehouses used to store agricultural products and provide for the issuance of receipts, including electronic receipts, for agricultural products stored or handled in licensed warehouses, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4868. To amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to modify temporarily certain rates of duty, to make other technical amendments to the trade laws, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 122. Making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes.

On November 2, 2000:

H.R. 4312. To direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of the suitability and feasibility of establishing an Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Area in the State of Connecticut and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3621. To provide for the posthumous promotion of William Clark of the Commonwealth of Virginia and the Commonwealth of Kentucky, co-leader of the Lewis and Clark Expedition, to the grade of captain in the Regular Army.

H.R. 3388. To promote environmental restoration around the Lake Tahoe basin.

H.R. 1444. To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a program to plan, design, and construct fish screens, fish passage devices, and related features to mitigate impacts on fisheries associated with irrigation system water diversions by local governmental entities in the Pacific Ocean drainage of the States of Oregon, Washington, Montana, and Idaho.

H.R. 660. For the private relief of Ruth Hairston by waiver of a filing deadline for appeal from a ruling relating to her application for a survivor annuity.

H.R. 848. For the relief of Sepandan Farnia and Farbod Farnia.

H.R. 3184. For the relief of Zohreh Farhang Ghahfarokhi.

H.R. 3414. For the relief of Luis A. Leon Molina, Ligia Padron, Juan Leon Padron,