

the founding of the country to help one group—white Southern males—and this year, it has apparently done just that.”

In the years after the forced-end of slavery, former slave states like Florida imposed those felon-disenfranchisement laws, precisely to disempower freed-but-impoverished Blacks. The political parties crafted the statewide primary system into what amounted to a white-man’s private club to keep the newly enfranchised under the old establishment’s control. Then came literacy tests and poll taxes—voters had to keep their tax-receipts on file—anything to keep electoral power in white hands. For an idea of what those tackling literacy tests faced, consider: under Jim Crow, Florida required that textbooks used by the public school children of one race be kept separate from those used by the other—even in storage.

After the 1965 Act was passed, states did everything they could to dilute Black influence. Winner-take-all systems, or absolute majority vote requirements were embraced to keep black candidates from winning over split fields of white candidates in local races—in just the same way as winner-take-all works in the presidential contest. More offices were filled by appointment. Legislative and congressional district lines were redrawn to keep black voting strength submerged.

None of this requires looking back very far: the same House Speaker, Tim Feeney, who wants the Florida legislature to select a Bush slate of Electors no matter what the vote-counters count, suggested reintroducing literacy tests just two weeks ago: “Voter confusion is not a reason for whining or crying or having a revote,” said Feeney. “It may be a reason to require literacy tests.” (Palm Beach Post, 11/16.)

The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, who may well be the final arbiter of which votes get counted and which (white) man gets the White House, is William Rehnquist, a segregationist from way back.

In 1962, Republican activist William (then “Bill”) Rehnquist was the leader of Operation Eagle Eye, a flying squad of GOP lawyers that swept through polling places in south Phoenix to question the right of minority voters to cast their ballots. As Dave Wagner reported in the Arizona Republic last year, Rehnquist defended keeping African Americans out of stores and restaurants in Phoenix. In 1964, at the Bethune Precinct, (which was 40 percent Hispanic and 90 percent Democratic) Rehnquist and Operation Eagle Eye activists challenged every Black and Mexican voter’s ability to read the Constitution of the United States in the English language (then a requirement.)

The result, according to one witness, was “a line a half-block long, four abreast . . . They wanted people to become frustrated and leave.” In his testimony to a US Senate hearing on his appointment to the Supreme Court, Rehnquist denied that he officially challenged anyone’s right to vote. Just as today’s defenders of Bush, argue that voter error, not bias, disproportionately shrank the counted vote, Rehnquist argued that he broke no rules, he was just following the law.

Trying to wage politics in the US while tiptoeing around racism is like sidestepping an elephant. It’s dangerous, it’s not smart, and it won’t work. What suppresses the Black and minority vote suppresses the Democratic and liberal-progressive vote. The majority of white male voters haven’t pooled Democratic since 1964 and only women of color create the gender gap for Gore. Yet the unequal distribution of resources and bias that created a practically apartheid voting system in Florida was sustained by the Democratic Party—who approved of the process, try as they might to blame the Gov-

ernor’s cronies. And Democratic pro-drug war, pro-death penalty, pro-felon disenfranchisement policies stoked the racist atmosphere in which this election was held.

The conditions are ripe for a pro-democracy movement. A moment, at least: this is it. Some things have changed in the nation since 1964, and when the public has heard (or seen on CSPAN) the witnesses who gave the NAACP testimony, they have been shocked. Voter protests in Florida have built a multi-racial coalition, that is advocating the kind of electoral reform the whole nation could get behind. Among their demands: a non-partisan election commission, standardized voting procedures and federal enforcement of the Voting Rights Act. Add to that, the longer-term structural changes some advocate: instant run off voting, or some form of proportional representation, so that small parties (and minority constituencies) could build support for their issues without throwing elections to their foes.

The public has seen the Electoral College in its worst light: for the first time, the tyranny of a minority may contradict the popular will. Perhaps something will come of the shared experience of disenfranchisement. But not if we don’t talk about what’s at the root of it: racism. Not “the system,” but this particular, racist one. And those who’ve been marginalized must occupy the center. People of color are central to why our electoral system is set up this way; likewise, they must be at the heart of any movement for real democracy. We can get rid of the racism, but only if we all shove that elephant out at once.

[IMPORTANT NOTE: The views and opinions expressed on this list are solely those of the authors and/or publications, and do not necessarily represent or reflect the official political positions of the Black Radical Congress (BRC). Official BRC statements, position papers, press releases, action alerts, and announcements are distributed exclusively via the BRC-PRESS list. As a subscriber to this list, you have been added to the BRC-PRESS list automatically.]

RECEIVING OF THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORAL BALLOTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I follow my colleague, because I believe it is important to speak to the real authority of this Nation, and that is the people of the United States of America, as I as well speak to my colleagues. I believe that this day should be further enlightened with an explanation of the reason of the objection in opposition of some reasons of the House of Representatives.

First, let me acknowledge something that is very dear to me: my choice to be a member of the United States Congress and the people’s House is a purposeful choice. That choice is because it is, in fact, the people’s House, the body closest to the American people, to touch and feel them and to understand them. For that reason, as a Texan, I went to Florida and spent almost the entire month of November interacting with Floridians, young people, minorities, working people, and the elderly. And to a one, they expressed to me their consternation, their concern,

their fear, that they had not voted correctly, or that they were thwarted and prohibited from voting.

So as I reflected on this very important day; in fact, January 6, 2001, a day in years past that most Americans never realized in presidential elections that on this day, as ordered by statute, we are to come here and to affirm the electoral college.

But as I rummaged, if you will, or ran my fingers through the Constitution of the United States, I found the words of Alexander Hamilton, and they say, “The sacred rights of mankind are not to be rummaged, for among old parchments or musty records, they are written as with a sunbeam in the whole volume of human nature by the hand of the divinity itself, and can never be erased or obscured by mortal power.”

So I felt obligated passionately, without regard for political reprimand, to come forward and to voice my opposition to the inaccurate and the unjust count in the State of Florida. There are voiceless people throughout this Nation in States all across this country who believe that their votes were not accurately counted. Today, in order to do that, I presented to this body a letter signed by Members of the House without a Senator to suggest that I would object to the inaccurate count in Florida, as well as the violations of the Voter Rights Act of 1965.

Additionally, I submitted a motion to delay, because what is required, or what we should have, is a quorum. That means that all of my colleagues should have been able to secure the appropriate time to be able to be here. I respect them. I know that they have responsibilities in their districts. So my motion would have delayed this vote, until a quorum could have been achieved, for both the House and the Senate. Because I would remind my colleagues that in this place, it is the people’s House and every single American should have had the right of having their representative here. I wanted to give my colleagues the chance to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the diplomacy and the decorum of the President in this instance, the Vice President of the United States, AL GORE. I cannot thank him enough for the way he presided over these proceedings, and I understand his overruling my objections. But in so doing, I must say to my colleagues that even as he overruled it because of the Rules of the House, I stand here today to put on record the fact that it is important that we acknowledge the existence of the Voter Rights Act of 1965, which affirms the right of every U.S. citizen to cast their ballot and have that ballot counted and be protected without compromise and without regard to the voter’s race.

Mr. Speaker, this is a task for the Federal Government, because Federal guarantees and Federal elections are at stake. That is why on the very first day of this new body, I put into the record H.R. 60 and H.R. 62. I am serious

about my criticism, and that is a major piece of legislation to reform the electoral system, to ensure that in Federal elections that new technology be used across this Nation.

Let me say to those of us who are Americans, I appreciate the challenges that we have. Therefore, I say to my colleagues, do we not think a country that prides itself in democracy, prides itself in the recognition of the 3 bodies of government, that we should have a national Federal holiday so that we can vote, so that the doors of the work places are closed, so that everyone, no matter what one's party affiliation or what one's view is, be able to go. That is what H.R. 62 is, to declare every 4 years a national holiday so that all Americans might vote.

Many of my colleagues may not be aware that the numbers of allegations of voter irregularities that occurred in the State of Florida are revealed to have been that a total 180,000 ballots were not counted in Florida's presidential election. In four counties it is found, where the hand count was sought, all heavily democratic areas, over 73,000 ballots were not counted in the presidential tally. Might I share with my colleagues a personal view. I actually believe that after November 7, we should have recounted the entire State. I have no problem in finding out the truth. The Declaration of Independence has indicated that there is a self-evident truth, and why not find out whether or not all of these votes were accurately counted. We did not do that. But the Florida Supreme Court on November 21st attempted to allow us to count the votes.

My great disappointment was that the Florida Supreme Court oversaw State law, as is rightly so, the separation of States from the Federal Government, and what happened? The interjection of 5 partisan Supreme Court justices who, in their own right, suggested that this was a unanimous decision on December 12 at 10 p.m., way after the time we could have gone into the count, after having stopped the counting over the weekend, indicated that they would make the decision who would be the President of the United States: President-elect George Bush and Mr. CHENEY.

I am not here to thwart the transfer of power on January 20, 2001. I will abide by the laws of this Nation, and so will the rest of America. But might I say, it does not behoove a country that believes in freedom, that projects itself as a leader of the free world, where other nations look to us to tell how they can vote and be free, the Bosnians, the Kosovos, the South Africas, that we too not stand up and be counted and remain steadfast on the question that every precious vote counts and the will of the people, no matter what it be, that one agrees or disagrees, be the deciding factor.

So I say to my colleagues, the court, as Justice Breyer said, is not acting to vindicate a fundamental constitutional

principle, but such as the need to protect a basic human liberty. What Justice Breyer said is that the Supreme Court was denying us our liberty, denying us our right, and that the Supreme Court ruled incorrectly on December 12, 2001.

I leave my colleagues simply with the understanding that freedom is not free, and that all of us might fight within the laws of this Nation and the right to protest, the First Amendment right to speak, to be able to protect, and yes, to be able to speak on behalf of voiceless Americans who voted their conscience.

Mr. President-elect, I look forward to working with you. I hope that you will draw us into your chambers, into the White House, and I ask that we sit down and talk about the issues. I hope you will hear our voices on John Ashcroft and Linda Chavez, because if we are to heal this Nation, we must heal it together.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to object to the receiving of this years presidential electoral ballots, specifically, those electoral votes from the state of Florida, in what was the closest and most contested presidential election in the history of our great nation.

I have been raised to tell the truth. I also have been raised to respect our flag, the freedom of our democracy and the right to express our fundamental beliefs.

While I realize that the transfer of power will occur on January 20, 2001, barring a different decision today, I believe it is imperative that I attempt to register an objection on the grounds of the inaccurate count and undercount in Florida resulting in the election being won for Mr. Bush and Mr. Cheney and not Mr. GORE and Mr. LIEBERMAN.

I believe if the results remain the same today, then at least this Congress should promptly engage in a serious review and reform of the election process in this nation as a recognition of the disenfranchisement of voters, not only in Florida but around the country.

FACTS

On November 7th 2000, I was in Nashville, Tennessee, watching the election results when about 3 a.m. in the morning, the votes that were originally called for Governor Bush deteriorated to just a difference of 569 votes or less than 1 percent between Vice President GORE and Governor Bush, thus, triggering an automatic recount.

On Tuesday, November 14, 2000, Florida's Republican Secretary of State Katherine Harris gave a 5 p.m. for countries to report their election returns. Also, on that day, Broward County granted Vice President GORE's request for a full hand recount, however, Circuit Judge Terry Lewis ruled that Harris could enforce the deadline but required her to use flexibility in her decision.

On Wednesday, November 15, 2000 Secretary Harris announced that the official Bush lead over GORE was 300 votes and gave a 2 p.m. deadline for countries to justify late returns. Florida's Supreme Court rejected Bush's bid to block the recount and a federal appeals court in Atlanta agreed to hear Bush's request to block all Florida hand recounts. Palm Beach County also got the green light for its recount with a ruling that the canvassing board could decide how to review the votes.

On Thursday, November 16, 2000, Secretary Harris refused counties' justifications for submitting late returns, however, the Florida Supreme Court gave the green light to Florida counties to go ahead with ballot hand recounts.

On Friday, November 17, 2000, Circuit Judge Lewis ruled that Harris could reject returns filed after the November 14th deadline. Vice President GORE appealed Lewis's decision to the Florida Supreme Court and the Florida Supreme Court ruled that Secretary Harris could not certify the results on Saturday; the Court set hearings on the issue for Monday, November 20. Also on that day, thousands of Florida absentee ballots from overseas are due by midnight which would be included in the state total. In addition, a hearing is held on the constitutionality of a revote in Palm Beach.

On Saturday, November 18th, 2000, States had a noon deadline to submit overseas ballot counts. Hand recounts proceed in Broward and Palm Beach counties and Miami-Dade County officials meet again to consider a full recount of more than 600,000 votes.

On Monday, November 20 the Florida Supreme Court heard arguments on whether Harris had final authority to certify ballots as to the Nov. 14 deadline and the Florida Attorney General said that overseas ballots, mostly from military bases, that were rejected because they lacked postmarks should be counted.

On Tuesday, November 21st, 2000, them Florida Supreme Court ruled that hand-recounted votes could be accepted for six more days.

On Wednesday, November 22nd, 2000, Miami-Dade County halted its unfinished recount amid dispute over standards for counting ballots due to heated protests by a hysterical pro-Bush crowd. On that same day Bush appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court to halt the recount.

On Thursday, November 23rd, 2000 the Florida Supreme Court rejected GORE's appeal to force Miami-Dade to reconvene their recount. On Friday, November, 24, 2000 the U.S. Supreme Court agreed to hear Bush's appeal and on Saturday, November 25, Bush dropped his lawsuit on counting military absentee ballots, but filed suits in five individual counties.

On Sunday, November 26, 2000, the Florida Supreme Court set 5 p.m. deadline for the Secretary of State's office to accept all recounts. Florida certified the election results, declaring Bush the winner by 537 of the nearly 6 million votes cast. The Palm Beach hand recounts are not included in the total.

On Monday, November 27, 2000, GORE went on national television to defend his call for recounts and filed suit in local count contesting Florida the results.

On Tuesday, November 28, 2000, GORE called for a seven-day plan to recount Florida votes to begin immediately. The Leon County Circuit Court Judge agreed to consider the recount but held off on hearings until December 2nd. Also, GORE and Bush lawyers delivered briefs to the U.S. Supreme Court for their December 1st hearing.

On Thursday, November 30, 2000 Palm Beach shipped ballots to Tallahassee for a December 2nd hearing and GORE appealed Leon County's refusal to begin immediate recount to the U.S. Supreme Court.

On Friday, December 1st, 2000, the U.S. Supreme Court Justices heard the Gore-Bush

case. Also on that day, the Florida Supreme Court rejected GORE's appeal for expedited recount also ruling the "butterfly ballot" constitutional.

On Saturday, December 2nd, 2000, the Leon County Circuit Court considered recounts of 1 million ballots from Miami-Dade and Palm Beach counties.

On Monday, December 4, 2000, the U.S. Supreme Court sets aside the Florida Supreme Court decision extending deadline for recounts, and sent it back to the state court for further clarification of its ruling.

On Tuesday, December 5, 2000 the Florida Supreme Court scheduled oral arguments for Thursday for GORE's appeal of Monday's ruling rejecting his challenge to the certification of Bush as Florida's winner and the 11th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals also heard arguments on Bush's effort to have the manual recounts declared unconstitutional.

On Wednesday, December 6, 2000, the Federal appeals court in Atlanta refused to throw out recounted votes in three Florida counties. On Thursday, December 7th, Gore lawyers argued for recounts before Florida Supreme Court. Also, trials on absentee ballots in Seminole and Martin counties ended.

On Friday, December 8th, 2000 the Florida Supreme Court ordered immediate manual recounts of ballots from Miami-Dade and other counties. The 4-3 vote gave GORE another 383 votes from earlier partial recounts. Also on that day, the Circuit courts in Seminole and Martin counties rule that absentee ballots did not violate the law though Republican workers filled in missing ID numbers.

On Saturday, December 9th, 2000 the U.S. Supreme Court agreed to Bush's appeal for a halt to recount and scheduled oral arguments from both sides for Monday, December 11th.

On Monday, December 11, 2000 the U.S. Supreme Court heard oral arguments on Bush's appeal to halt the Florida vote recount.

On Tuesday, December 12th, 2000 Florida designated 25 electors pledged to Bush for the Electoral College vote. The Florida Supreme Court rejected Democrats' bid to throw out absentee ballots they charged that Republicans tampered with.

On Wednesday, December 13, 2000, Bush declared victory, and GORE conceded.

ANALYSIS

Mr. Speaker, upon my recital of this past elections events, I rise today to express concern for the health of our democracy. I am an American. These words are the montra of our nation. These words express our unity of purpose to create a different form of government that will allow for all to be heard equally without prejudice or favor.

Mr. Speaker, I am an American. I say this with pride for my country and its heritage and prejudice toward other forms of governance and community that do not embrace liberty and freedom for all.

I am an American and therefore it goes without saying that I truly believe that all men, the species human both male and female, are equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, which is expressed by our nation's founders in the Constitution of the United States.

While I have accepted and will abide by the decision of our nation's highest court which re-

sulted in President-Elect Bush's winning Florida States electoral votes which were in heavy contest, I have risen today to speak on the need for election reform; and to lift my voice on behalf of the thousands of disfranchised voters in Florida and states throughout the nation who were silenced.

Mr. Speaker, on November 7th, 2000, only some of the citizens of the United States were able to exercise their right to vote and have it counted. It is inescapable that critical mistakes were made and there were serious allegations of violations of Voter Rights Act of 1965 that have been made during and after the November 7, elections and throughout the nation.

Victims and witnesses to Election Day irregularities and discriminatory practices at voting precincts came forward in significant numbers to tell their stories of how their votes were discarded and their votes silenced which resulted in their disenfranchisement. In fact, many disenfranchised voters did ask, "could I get another ballot," but were told they could not.

On November 11, the NAACP conducted a hearing in Florida regarding the election. After reviewing allegations made at the NAACP hearing and hearing numerous other allegations from constituents and citizens throughout the country, I and members of the CBC met and also held press conferences to announce that there was substantial evidence indicating that many African-Americans and other minorities were denied their fundamental rights as citizens of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, we must do all that we can today, to stop these political partisan games from being played in the future to usurp the right given to all American citizens, the right to vote. We should look to being a government of the people that is governed by the people. We must listen to the voices of the people spoken through their votes, which is guaranteed by the United States Constitution.

Thomas Paine's work titled the "Rights of Man," said this regarding constitutions; "That men mean distinct and separate things when they speak of constitutions and of governments. . . . A constitution is not the act of a government, but of a people constituting a government without a constitution, is power without a right."

The people of this nation at its inception said, "We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this constitution for the United States of America."

Mr. Speaker, dear colleagues, as the elected representative for all the people, we need to find a remedy to ensure that every citizen's vote counts. The information presented in the Florida State Legislature hearings and NAACP hearings in Florida included first-hand accounts from victims and eyewitnesses of the following:

1. That citizens who were properly registered were denied the right to vote because election officials could not find their names on the precinct rolls and that some of these voters went to their polling place with registration identification cards but still were denied the right to vote;

2. That registered voters were denied the right to vote because of minor discrepancies between the name appearing on the registration lists and the name on their identification;

3. The first-time voters who sent in voter registration forms prior to the state's deadline for registration were denied the right to vote because their registration forms were not processed and their names did not appear on the precinct rolls;

4. That African-American voters were singled out for criminal background checks at some precincts and that one voter who had never been arrested was denied the right to vote after being told that he had a prior felony conviction;

5. That African-American voters were required to show photo ID while white voters at the same precincts were not subjected to the same requirement;

6. That voters who requested absentee ballots did not receive them but were denied the right to vote when they went to the precinct in person on election day;

7. That hundreds of absentee ballots of registered voters in Hillsborough County (a county covered by Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act) were improperly rejected by the Supervisor of Elections and not counted;

8. That African-American voters who requested assistance at the polls were denied assistance;

9. That African-American voters who requested the assistance of a volunteer Creole/English speaker who were willing to translate the ballot for limited proficient voters were denied such assistance;

10. That police stopped African-American voters as they entered and exited a polling place in Progress Village Center; and

11. That election officials failed to notify voters in a predominantly African American precinct that their polling place, a school, was closed and failed to direct them by signs or other means to the proper polling location.

There were also an unprecedented number of complaints of similar problems in other parts of the nation. Calls flooded the NAACP offices and other agencies seeking to lodge complaints about registered voters who were turned away from the polls because their names mysteriously did not appear in the precinct books.

In Virginia, there were numerous complaints of voters who registered in social services offices under the provisions of the National Voter Rights Act of 1965 who were not allowed to vote because their registrations were not recorded. Among other examples, there were numerous reports in New York city that minority voters were denied the right to vote and in St. Louis, eyewitnesses say that at some precincts African-American voters were asked to show ID, while white voters in the same line were not asked to produce any identification.

These allegations raise potential violations of Sections 2 and 5 of the Voter Rights Act of 1965, 42 U.S.C. 1973, as well as several provisions of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993, 42 U.S.C. 1973gg-5(a) which affirms the right of every U.S. citizen to cast a ballot and have that ballot be counted and be protected without compromise and without regard to the voter's race. This is a task for the federal government because federal guarantees in federal elections are at stake.

Mr. Speaker, this was truly a time in which justice delayed was justice denied. In addition to the number of allegations of voting irregularities that occurred in the state of Florida, it was revealed that a total of 180,000 ballots

were not counted in Florida's presidential vote. The Gore Campaign, members of the Congressional Black Caucus, civil rights attorney's and the disenfranchised voters themselves sought for every Floridian's vote to be counted by requesting a hand count in the four counties that demonstrated voting irregularities. In these four counties in which the hand count was sought—all heavily Democratic areas—over 73,000 ballots were not counted in the presidential tally.

The Florida State Supreme Court attempted to remedy the disenfranchisement of its voters on November 21st, 2000, by holding in a unanimous decision to allow for a recount. It was a victory for the people and a victory for democracy. However, this decision was ultimately overturned by the U.S. Supreme Court in a curium decision (unanimous decision), and remanded back to the Florida State Supreme Court for clarification of the authority the Florida Supreme Courts decision was relied upon.

Mr. Speaker, from day one, all that I have wanted is for the will of the people of Florida to be completely and accurately reflected. It is evident by the laws of the state of Florida and the judicial history of election law in this country that a recount was a matter for the State, and not Federal Courts to decide.

Mr. Speaker I come from a county of about 1 million. 995,000 people voted in Harris County. We discarded 6,000 votes in Harris County, Texas. However, in one Palm Beach County in Florida, approximately 19,000 ballots were discarded. In that one county 19,000 citizen's voices were silenced. Florida Secretary of State, Katherine Harris, a strong Bush supporter who campaigned for him gave a short deadline for the electoral votes to be delivered to her which would not allow adequate time for a recount, thus, ensuring the disenfranchisement of the Florida citizens and delivering that state's electoral votes to Bush. This in violation of the state of Florida's own election laws which in Florida, as in most states, the will of the people is determined by a hand recount.

The Florida Supreme Court, the highest court of that state, in a unanimous ruling agreed that this was indeed the law of Florida and overruled the Florida Secretary of States deadline, thus, calling on a recount by the four counties with the highest volume of disenfranchised votes. In reaching its holding the Florida State Supreme Court cited the Illinois Supreme Court who made it clear that the vote intent standard ought to be the standard used in determining the will of the people. The Illinois Supreme Court had dealt specifically with the dimpled chad issue.

The Bush campaign argued against the Florida State Supreme Court ruling stating that this process would cause disruption and instability and yet it was their campaign that went to court in the first place and it was their campaign that suggested that the rule of law and our Constitutional processes be circumvented in favor of a partisan political solution.

I have always believed that more people went to the polls in Florida to vote for AL GORE than went to vote for George W. Bush. I believe that the hand recount would have shown that to be the case. And the fact that the Bush campaign fought this so strenuously shows that they knew this to be the case also.

We are a nation of laws. We have been one for over 200 years. The Florida State Supreme Court is the highest court of the state. Their job was to resolve legal questions, such as the one they looked at on November 21st.

I had faith in the people of Florida. However, Republicans ignored the will of the people by stalling and ultimately defeating the recount process. Assertions had been made during the Florida Electoral Vote contest that Republicans had made efforts to try and stall the recount effort in Florida. In fact, Republicans involved in the recount process had even admitted that they used delaying tactics. They continued to object to as many ballots as they could to slow down the recount process. In one Palm Beach County precinct alone, they objected to over 200 ballots to force a slowdown of the recount process. However, when those ballots went in front of the county canvassing commission, only 3 were called into question.

Mr. Speaker, on December 8, 2000 the Florida State Supreme Court again took up the issue remanded to them by the U.S. Supreme Court on whether to allow for a recount, and again the Florida State Supreme Court held in favor of an immediate manual recount of the presidential election under-votes in Miami-Dade Counties and all Florida counties.

I believe that this was the right decision. Floridians just wanted to have a fair process for the counting of their votes and this was granted by the Florida State Supreme Court. As American citizens they are entitled to that. The Florida Supreme Court's ruling was delivered a critical juncture in the face of the recount process and would have resolved much of the legal ambiguity regarding recounts that haunts this country today.

The Florida Supreme Court's decision should have been implemented as ordered without hesitation. We would have then been able to come together as Americans, thus, ensuring that the 43rd President of the United States was elected by the people. However, on December 9, 2000, the U.S. Supreme Court ordered an injunction to stop the manual recount of the under-votes in Miami-Dade County and all the Florida counties ordered by the Florida Supreme Court.

On the night of December 12, 2000, the U.S. Supreme Court, in a controversial 5-4 decision delivered the court holding which prohibited all the legal votes in Florida from being counted, thus, ensuring then-Governor Bush receiving Florida's electoral votes to win the presidential election. As I stated at the beginning of my statement; while I was disappointed with the U.S. Supreme Courts ruling, as a member of the United States Congress sworn to uphold the laws and Constitution of the United States, I accepted and will abide by the decision of our nation's highest court as the supreme legal and constitutional authority of our great country. However, I concur with Justice Ginsburg's statement when she said "the Court's conclusion that a constitutionally adequate recount is impractical is a prophecy the Court's own judgement will not allow to be tested. Such an untested prophecy should not decide the Presidency of the United States."

Furthermore, Justice Stevens assessment that this nation will never know with certainty the true identity of the winner of this years presidential election. If we have learned anything from the Justices of the Supreme Court, however, is that it is up to this nation, through the United States Congress, state legislatures, and local communities to correct the problems highlighted in the past year's presidential election to correct the problems to ensure that the will of all the people in future elections is not thwarted.

In addition, Justice Breyer, like three other justices, found an alternative constitutional analysis that would have permitted a recount of counting process in Florida stating ". . . [T]here is no justification for the majority's remedy, which is simply to reverse the lower court and halt the recount entirely. An appropriate remedy would be, instead, to remand this case with instructions that, even at this late date, would permit the Florida Supreme Court to require all undercounted votes in Florida, including those from Broward, Volusia, Palm Beach, and Miami-Dade Counties, whether or not previously recounted prior to the end of the protest period, and to do so with a single-uniform substandard."

Justice Breyer emphasized that "by halting the manual recount, and thus ensuring that the uncounted legal votes would not be counted under any standard, the Court crafted a remedy out of proportion to the asserted harm. And that remedy harms the very fairness interests the Court is attempting to protect. The manual recount would itself redress a problem of unequal treatment of ballots."

Justice Breyer also added: ". . . [The] Court is not acting to vindicate a fundamental constitutional principle, such as the need to protect a basic human liberty. No other strong reason to act is present. Congressional statutes tend to obviate the need. And, above all, in this highly politicized matter, the appearance of a split decision runs the risk of undermining the public's confidence in the Court itself. That confidence is a public treasure. It has been built slowly over many years, some of which were marked by Civil War and the tragedy of segregation. It is a vitally necessary ingredient of any successful effort to protect basic liberty and indeed, the rule of law itself. We run no risk of returning to the days when a President (responding to this Court's effort to protect the Cherokee Indians) might have said, "John Marshall has made his decision; now let him enforce it! Loth, Chief John Justice Marshall and The Growth of the American Republic 365 (1948). But we do risk a self-inflicted wound—wound that may harm not just the Court, but the Nation."

Mr. Speaker, the basic right to have your voted counted is a basic right guaranteed and protected by the United States Constitution. It is understood that the preamble to the Constitution of the United States is not a source of power for any department of the Federal Government, however, the Supreme Court has often referred to it as evidence of the origin, scope, and purpose of the Constitution. In *Jacobson vs. Massachusetts*, Justice Harlan wrote in 1905, "Although that preamble indicates the general purposes for which the people ordained and established the Constitution, it has never been regarded as the source of any substantive power conferred on the government of the United States, or on any of its departments. Such powers embrace only those expressly granted in the body of the Constitution, and such as may be implied from those so granted."

This constitution like all constitutions is the property of a nation, and not of those who exercise the government. It is our belief, as Americans, that this democracy—our democracy was and continues under the direct authority of the people of this nation.

All power exercised over a nation, must have some beginning. In the United States the beginning of power is found in the Constitution, but in the history of mankind power has found two sources it may either be delegated, or assumed. There are no other sources of power other than the consent of the governed. All delegated power is trust, and all assumed power is usurpation. Time does not alter truth of this statement it only makes its truth clearer to those who can see and to those who are enlightened history.

The Constitution of the United States does not provide an explicit language to preserve the boundaries nor does it provide checks and balances between the legislative, executive and judicial branches of government that it establishes. However, it does grant to these branches of federal government separately the power to legislate, to execute, and to adjudicate, and it provides throughout the document the means to accomplish those ends in a manner that would allow each of the branches of government to avoid "blandishments and incursions of the others." The beauty of this document is its goals, which was to order to system of federal government by conferring sufficient power to govern while withholding the ability to abridge the liberties of the governed. To this reason, I share Henry David Thoreau's view that "Government does not keep the country free."

The long standing theory of elaborated and implemented constitutional power is grounded on several principles chief of which are: the conception that each branch performs unique and identifiable functions that are appropriate to each; and the limitation of the personnel of each branch to that branch, so that no one person or group should be able to serve in more than one branch simultaneously.

Paine offered that Government is not a trade which any man or body of men has a right to set and exercise for his own emolument, but is altogether a trust, in right of those by whom that trust is delegated, and by who it is always presumable.

Unfortunately in the evidence of the resolution of the election that very thing has occurred. The United States Supreme Court who is sworn to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States may in fact have issued a ruling that will erode the Constitution.

The Supreme Court has more cases presented than it can possibly review and for this reason has over time applied two rules to judge the appropriateness of review the Standing Doctrine and the Ripeness Doctrine.

Standing as a doctrine is composed of both constitutional and prudential restraints on the power of the federal courts to render decisions. In Valley Forge Christian College vs. Americans United, decided in 1982, Renquist wrote that the exercise of judicial power under Art. III is restricted to litigants who can show "injury in fact" resulting from the action that they seek to have the court adjudicate. Doctrine of "standing" has a core constitutional component that a plaintiff must allege personal injury fairly traceable to the defendant's allegedly unlawful conduct and likely to be redressed by the requested relief. The concepts of the standing doctrine present questions that must be answered by reference to the Article III notion that federal courts may exercise power only in the last resort and as a necessity, and only when adjudication is consistent with a system of separated powers and the

dispute is one traditionally thought to be capable of resolution through the judicial process.

Justice O'Connor wrote in the Court's majority opinion in *Allen vs. Wright*, 468 US 73, "All of the doctrines that cluster about Article III—not only standing but mootness, ripeness, political question, and the like—relate in part, and in different though overlapping ways, to an idea, which is more than an intuition but less than a rigorous and explicit theory, about the constitutional and prudential limits to the powers of an unelected, unrepresentative judiciary in our kind of government."

The case brought before the Court titled *Bush vs. Gore* did not establish the fine points of standing because no injury had been incurred by Bush. It was only the presumption of impending injury that prompted the Court's action. Bush anticipated losing the electors apportioned to the State of Florida, which would have decided the national election in Vice President GORE's favor.

Just as the question of standing has weight and breath in the life of Judicial Review so does the Ripeness Doctrine, which defines when a case may be brought before the Supreme Court for review. In the case of *United Public Workers vs. Mitchell*, the Court ruled that it could not rule in the matter because the plaintiffs "where not threatened with actual interference with their interest," there was only a potential threat of interference of their interest. The Court viewed the threat hypothetical and not established in the realm of reality where squarely their purview had effect. It had been well established and excepted that pre-enforcement challenges to criminal and regulatory legislation will often be unripe for judicial consideration because of uncertainty of enforcement.

The Court when it ordered a stop to the counting of ballots ordered by the Florida Supreme Court ended any possible light being shown on the issue of injury to presidential candidate Bush.

The dissenting view offered by Justice Stevens and joined by Justice Ginsburg and Justice Breyer, Stevens stated that the issue presented to the Court had been assigned to the States by the Constitution. Article II, Section 1 of the Constitution defines that each state shall appoint, in such manner as the Legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the state may be entitled for the purpose of choosing the President and Vice President of the United States.

There is inherent in the arcane and disjointed method of local state, and national elections disparity of treatment in that all voters do not use the same method of voting. The condition of the Florida election was the fruit of this disparity in that the variations in the methods voting lead to different methods of tallying votes and different success or failure rates in the accuracy of those tallies. The more modern pencil mark to fill an oval on a paper ballot that is fed into a computer to tally votes was found to only hold a three percent error rate while the punch card method of tallying votes had a fifteen percent error rate.

It is clear that the injured party in this matter are the voters of Florida who had to suffer through the biased actions of a Secretary of State who acted as the Co-Florida State Chair for the Bush for President effort. The voters struggled to be heard in the face of repeated challenges and disruptions designed to end an

order process of discerning voter intent when the machine failed in that determination. A constitution is the property of a nation, and not of those who exercise the government. All the constitutions of America are declared to be established on the authority of the people.

Aristotle in his work titled "Politics" stated that "democracy is the form of government in which the free are rulers." With the Supreme Court choosing by a one vote majority to rule in favor of the hand counting of ballots, as long as the method is uniform and did not violate the Safe Harbor Provision of the Constitution seemed in its reading to be an affirmation of the free ballot. However, history will not blur the directive of this decision, because it was delivered with only one hour and forty minutes left for the Florida Supreme Court to digest, implement and complete.

Over the course of the weeks leading to the decision it had been established that the process of counting ballots by hand was laborious and very time consuming. The force of the decision was an affront to the spirit and life of our nation's democracy. It was an act of treason to all of those who have fought, lost eye, limb or life in the effort to keep themselves and their progeny free to exercise those precious values of America's brand of democracy.

In the words of "Freedom," a poem by Langston Hughes we hear the threat to our national existence, "freedom will not come today, this year nor ever, through compromise and fear. I have as much right as the other fellow has to stand on my two feet and own the land. I tire so of hearing people say, let things take their course. Tomorrow is another day. I do not need my freedom when I'm dead. I cannot live on tomorrow's bread. Freedom is a strong seed planted in the soil. I live here too. I want freedom just as you."

I fear that our nation has lapsed into a world of "Orwellian double speak." Prior to the U.S. Supreme Court decision the double-speak of the Republican Party was that very open public process of hand counting ballots was the casting of votes. In the aftermath of the Supreme Court decision to in effect select the 43rd President of the United States the Republican leadership engaged in a display of double-speak. "The president-elect was chosen by a constitutional method, and "President-elect Bush won the State of Florida," are only two of the double-speak phrases which have resulted.

The result of this infamous decision is that thousands of people were shunned by the country we have known, slaved and died for on and off its blooded battlefields. Exposed naked and raw before the public stage as being of no consequence worth mentioning. I do remember the cries from Republicans and Democrats after it was learned that military service men and women votes cast by absentee ballot were under threat of not being counted. The cry that we should not disenfranchise these Americans was shared by all who appreciate their dedication and service to our nation. My pain was the lack of concern that those who were veterans of past conflicts were not given the same level of concern that their votes not go uncounted because they resided in Palm Beach County, and Miami County, Florida.

CONCLUSION

The principle of equality died a public death the day that the Supreme Court acted under the one vote majorities interest in rescuing the

failed presidential bid of their fellow Republican by acting in a perverse manner cloaked in judicial ease.

Niccolo Machiavelli would be very proud of the Republican Party's success at gaining the Presidency of the United States. It is a tragedy that the will of the people was ignored and the right to be counted was not adhered to. What occurred during the past election was "modern day Jim Crowism," which was erected from the burial grounds of statutes passed by the legislatures of the Southern states to prevent African Americans from voting after the Reconstruction era.

While statutes were not enacted during this past election to prevent minorities from voting, affirmative actions were taken that prevented minorities, women, the elderly and thousands of Democrats from invoking their constitutional right to vote.

Mr. Speaker, we must not let these "Jim Crow" actions to revive itself from the burial ground of this country's segregationist past. To do so would wash away the blood stains, and tears of our ancestors, parents and even ourselves who fought for the right of every citizen's voice to be heard legless of race, ethnicity, gender, age, and yes, even political affiliation.

ELECTION EVENTS

Tuesday, November 7—Voters across the United States cast their ballots.

Wednesday, November 8—The races in Florida, New Mexico and Oregon are too close to call.

Tuesday, November 14—5 PM deadline for counties to report elections returns imposed by Florida's Republican Secretary of State Katherine Harris.

Broward County reverses course and grants Gore's request for a full hand recount.

Circuit Judge Terry Lewis rules that Harris could enforce the deadline but requires her to use flexibility in her decision.

Wednesday, November 15—Harris announces official Bush lead of 300 votes and gives a 2 p.m. deadline for counties to justify late returns.

Florida's Supreme Court rejects Bush's bid to block the recount.

A federal appeals court in Atlanta agrees to hear Bush's request to block all Florida hand recounts.

Palm Beach County gets a green light for its recount with a ruling that the canvassing board could decide how to review the votes.

Thursday, November 16—Harris refuses counties' justifications for submitting late returns.

Florida Supreme Court gives the green light to Florida counties to go ahead with ballot hand recounts.

Bush decides against contesting Iowa results, which give Gore a narrow lead.

Friday, November 17—Circuit Judge Lewis rules that Harris can reject returns filed after Nov. 14 deadline.

Gore appeals Lewis decision to Florida Supreme Court, Florida Supreme Court rules Harris may not certify results on Saturday; sets hearings on issue for Monday, Nov. 20.

Thousands for Florida absentee ballots from overseas are due by midnight Friday and will be added to the state total.

Hearing is held on the constitutionality of a re-vote in Palm Beach.

Saturday, November 18—States have noon deadline to submit overseas ballot counts.

Hand recounts proceed in Broward and Palm Beach counties.

Miami-Dade County officials meet again to consider a full hand recount of more than 600,000 votes.

Monday, November 20—Florida Supreme Court hears arguments on whether Harris

has final authority to certify ballots as of Nov. 14 deadline.

Florida Attorney general says overseas ballots, mostly from military bases, that were rejected because they lacked postmarks should be counted.

Tuesday, November 12—Florida Supreme Court rules that hand-recounted votes can be accepted for six more days.

Wednesday, November 22—Republican Vice Presidential Candidate Dick Cheney is hospitalized for chest pains.

Miami-Dade County halts unfinished recount amid dispute over standards for counting ballots.

Bush appeals to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Thursday, November 23—Florida Supreme Court rejects Gore appeal to force Miami-Dade to reconvene their recount.

Friday, November 24—U.S. Supreme Court agrees to hear Bush appeal.

Saturday, November 25—Bush drops lawsuit on counting military absentee ballots, but files suits in five individual counties.

Sunday, November 26—Florida Supreme Court sets 5pm deadline for the Secretary of State's office to accept all recounts.

Florida certifies election results, declaring Bush the winner by 537 of the nearly 6 million votes cast. Palm Beach hand recounts are not included in the total.

Monday, November 27—Gore goes on national television to defend his call for recounts and files suit in local court contesting Florida results.

Bush team calls for private donations to finance White House transition after the Clinton administration refuses to release funds traditionally provided for the hand-over.

Tuesday, November 28—Gore calls for seven-day plan to recount Florida votes to begin immediately. Leon County Circuit Court Judge agrees to consider the recount but holds off on hearing until December 2.

Gore, Bush lawyers deliver briefs to U.S. Supreme Court for December 1 hearing.

Wednesday, November 29—Bush opens transition office in McLean, VA. Gore vows to fight on until mid-December.

Thursday, November 30—Palm Beach ships ballots to Tallahassee for December 2 hearing.

Gore appeals Leon County refusal to begin immediate recount to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Friday, December 1—U.S. Supreme Court Justices hears case.

Florida Supreme Court rejects Gore's appeal for expedited recount Florida Supreme Court rules "butterfly ballot" constitutional.

Saturday, December 2—Leon County Circuit Court considers recounts of one million ballots from Miami-Dade and Palm Beach counties.

Monday, December 4—U.S. Supreme Court sets aside Florida Supreme Court decision extending deadline for recounts, sending it back to state court for further clarification of its ruling.

Tuesday, December 5—The Florida Supreme Court schedules oral arguments for Thursday for Gore's appeal of Monday's ruling rejecting his challenge to the certification of Bush as Florida's winner.

The 11th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals hears arguments on Bush's effort to have the manual recounts declared unconstitutional.

Wednesday, December 6—Fed appeals court in Atlanta refuses to throw out recounted votes in three Florida counties.

Thursday, December 7—Gore lawyers argue for recounts before Florida Supreme Court.

Trials on absentee ballots in Seminole and Martin counties end.

Friday, December 8—Florida supreme court orders immediate manual recounts of ballots from Miami-Dade and other counties.

The 4-3 vote gives Gore another 383 votes from earlier partial recounts.

Circuit courts in Seminole and Martin counties rule that absentee ballots did not violate the law though Republican workers filled in missing ID numbers.

Saturday, December 9—U.S. Supreme Court agrees to Bush's appeal for a halt to recount and schedules oral arguments from both sides for Monday.

Monday, December 11—U.S. Supreme Court hears oral arguments on Bush's appeal to halt the Florida vote recount.

Tuesday, December 12—Florida designates 25 electors pledged to Bush for Electoral College vote.

Florida Supreme Court rejects Democrats' bid to throw out absentee ballots they charge Republicans tampered with.

Wednesday, December 13—Bush declares victory, Gore concedes.

Monday, December 18—Members of the Electoral College cast their votes.

Saturday, January 20, 2001—Inauguration Day.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 6, 2001.

Hon. ALBERT GORE, Jr.,
Vice President of the United States and Senate President, Washington, DC.

DEAR VICE PRESIDENT GORE: We object to the 25 votes from the State of Florida for George W. Bush for President and Richard Cheney for Vice President. Notwithstanding the certification by the Governor of the State of Florida, it is the opinion of the undersigned that these 25 votes were not regularly given in that the plurality of votes in the State of Florida were in fact cast for Albert Gore, Jr. for President and Joseph I. Lieberman for Vice President. Further, certain violations of the Voter Rights Act of 1965 disenfranchised many voters prohibiting them from casting their vote which impacted the electoral vote. Therefore, no electoral vote of the State of Florida should be counted for George W. Bush for President or for Richard Cheney for Vice President.

Respectfully,
SHEILA JACKSON-LEE.
CARRIE P. MEEK.
EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON.
ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS.

MOTION TO DELAY OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. Jackson-Lee of Texas moves that the House delay the counting of the electoral votes until a quorum of both chambers is present.

This is a solemn day. This is a solemn day because it is a day when Congress will affirm the voice of the American people and procedural statutes dictated by 3 USC 15, 16 & 17.

Therefore, any proceeding should not be done in the absence of a quorum, especially, where more than 1/2 million people have a different opinion of the electoral result that will be affirmed today.

Therefore, all members of Congress should be allowed to go on the record to be heard on the issue.

SHEILA JACKSON-LEE.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS
OF THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS,
Washington, DC, January 6, 2001.

Hon. ALBERT GORE, Jr.,
Vice President of the United States and Senate President,

The Capital, Washington, DC.

DEAR VICE PRESIDENT GORE: We object to the 25 votes from the State of Florida for George W. Bush for President and Richard

Cheney for Vice President. Notwithstanding the certification by the Governor of the State of Florida, it is the opinion of the undersigned that these 25 votes were not regularly given in that the plurality of votes in the State of Florida were in fact cast for Albert Gore, Jr. for President and Joseph I. Lieberman for Vice President. Therefore, no electoral vote of Florida should be counted for George W. Bush for President or for Richard Cheney for Vice President.

Respectfully,

Eddie Bernice Johnson; Alcee L. Hastings; Carrie P. Meek; Corrine Brown; Sheila Jackson-Lee; Barbara Lee; Elijah E. Cummings; Maxine Waters; Cynthia McKinney; Eva M. Clayton.

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL TO IMPLEMENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE HASHEMITE KINGDOM OF JORDAN ON ESTABLISHMENT OF FREE TRADE AREA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 107-15)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit a legislative proposal to implement the Agreement between the United States of America and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan on the Establishment of a Free Trade Area. Also transmitted is a section-by-section analysis.

The U.S.-Jordan Free Trade Agreement (FTA) provides critical support for a pivotal regional partner for U.S. efforts in the Middle East peace process. Jordan has taken extraordinary steps on behalf of peace and has served as a moderating and progressive force in the region. This Agreement not only sends a strong and concrete message to Jordanians and Jordan's neighbors about the economic benefits of peace, but significantly contributes to stability throughout the region. This Agreement is the capstone of our economic partnership with Jordan, which has also included U.S.-Jordanian cooperation on Jordan's accession to the World Trade Organization (WTO), our joint Trade and Investment Framework Agreement, and our Bilateral Investment Treaty. This Agreement is a vote of confidence in Jordan's economic reform program, which should serve as a source of growth and opportunity for Jordanians in the coming years.

The U.S.-Jordan Free Trade Agreement achieves the highest possible commitments from Jordan on behalf of U.S. business on key trade issues, providing significant and extensive liberalization across a wide spectrum of trade issues. For example, it will eliminate all tariffs on industrial goods and

agricultural products within 10 years. The FTA covers all agriculture without exception. The Agreement will also eliminate commercial barriers to bilateral trade in services originating in the United States and Jordan. Specific liberalization has been achieved in many key services sectors, including energy distribution, convention, printing and publishing, courier, audiovisual, education, environmental, financial, health, tourism, and transport services.

In the area of intellectual property rights, the U.S.-Jordan Free Trade Agreement builds on the strong commitments Jordan made in acceding to the WTO. The provisions of the FTA incorporate the most up-to-date international standards for copyright protection, as well as protection for confidential test data for pharmaceuticals and agricultural chemicals and stepped-up commitments on enforcement. Among other things, Jordan has undertaken to ratify and implement the World Intellectual Property Organization's (WIPO) Copyright Treaty and WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty within 2 years.

The FTA also includes, for the first time ever in the text of a trade agreement, a set of substantive provisions on electronic commerce. Both countries agreed to seek to avoid imposing customs duties on electronic transmissions, imposing unnecessary barriers to market access for digitized products, and impeding the ability to deliver services through electronic means. These provisions also tie in with commitments in the services area that, taken together, aim at encouraging investment in new technologies and stimulating the innovative uses of networks to deliver products and services.

The FTA joins free trade and open markets with civic responsibilities. In this Agreement, the United States and Jordan affirm the importance of not relaxing labor or environmental laws in order to increase trade. It is important to note that the FTA does not require either country to adopt any new laws in these areas, but rather includes commitments that each country enforce its own labor and environmental laws.

The U.S.-Jordan Free Trade Agreement will help advance the long-term U.S. objective of fostering greater Middle East regional economic integration in support of the establishment of a just, comprehensive, and lasting peace, while providing greater market access for U.S. goods, services, and investment. I urge the prompt and favorable consideration of this legislation.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 6, 2001.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. CARSON of Indiana (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for January 3 on account of official business.

Mrs. BONO (at the request of Mr. Arney) for today on account of medical reasons.

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. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 1 of the 107th Congress, the House stands adjourned until Saturday, January 20, 2001, at 10 a.m.

Thereupon (at 3 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 1, the House adjourned until Saturday, January 20, 2001, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

19. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Tart Cherries Grown in the States of Michigan, et al.; Authorization of Japan as an Eligible Export Outlet for Diversion and Exemption Purposes [Docket No. FV00-930-4 FIR] received January 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

20. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Cranberries Grown in the States of Massachusetts, et al.; Temporary Suspension of Provisions in the Rules and Regulations [Docket No. FV00-929-6 FIR] received January 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

21. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Raisins Produced from Grapes Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV00-989-5 FIR] received January 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

22. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Certification of Beef from Argentina [Docket No. 00-079-1] received January 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

23. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection