Americans consecrated this ground with soil from the resting places of those who served and died on all fronts. We, too, declared ourselves against forgetting. We pledged then that America would honor and remember their selfless devotion on this Mall that commemorates democracy's march.

Apollinaire's words resonated again as E.B. Sledge reflected on the moment the Second World War ended: ''. . . sitting in a stunned silence, we remembered our dead . . . so many dead. . . . Except for a few widely scattered shouts of joy, the survivors of the abyss sat hollow-eyed, trying to comprehend a world without war.''

Yes. Individual acts by ordinary men and women in an extraordinary time—one exhausting skirmish, one determined attack, one valiant act of heroism, one dogged determination to give your all, one heroic act after another—by the thousands—by the millions—bound our country together as it has not been since, bound the living to the dead in common purpose and in service to freedom, and to life.

As a Marine wrote about his company, ''I cannot say too much for the men . . . I have seen a spirit of brotherhood . . . that goes with one foot here amid the friends we see, and the other foot there amid the friends we see no longer, and one foot is as steady as the other.''

Today we break ground. It is only fitting that the event that reshaped the modern world in the 20th century and marked our nation's emergency from the chrysalis of isolationism as the leader of the free world be commemorated on this site.

This Memorial honors those still living who served abroad and on the home front as well as those we have lost: the nearly 300,000 Americans who died in combat, and those among the millions who survived the war but who have since passed away. Among that number I count my inspired constituent Roger Durbin of Berkey, Ohio, who fought bravely with the 101st Armored Division in the Battle of the Bulge and who, because he could not forget, asked me in 1987 why there was no memorial in our nation's Capitol to commemorate the significance of that era. I regret that Roger was not able to see this day. To help us remember him and his contribution to this Memorial, we have with us today a delegation from his American Legion Post and his beloved family, his widow Marian, his son, Peter, and his daughter, Melissa, who is a member of the World War II Memorial Advisory Board.

Only poets can attempt to capture the terror, the fatigue, and the camaraderie among soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines in combat. This is a memorial to their heroic sacrifice. It is also a memorial for the living to remember how freedom in the 20th century was preserved for ensuing generations.

Poet Keith Douglas, died in foreign combat in 1944 at age 24. In predicting his own death, he wrote about what he called time's wrong-way telescope, and how he thought it might simplify him as people looked back at him over the distance of years. ''Through that lens,'' he demand, ''see if I seem/substance or nothing: of the world/deserving mention, or charitable oblivion . . .'' And then he ended with the request, ''Remember me when I am dead/and simplify me when I'm dead.'' What a strange and striking charge that is!

And yet here today we pledge that as the World War II Memorial is built, through the simplifying elements of stone, water, and light. There will be no charitable oblivion. America will not forget. The world will not forget. When we as a people can no longer remember the complicated individuals who walked in freedom's march—a husband, a sister, a friend, a brother, an uncle, a father—when those individuals become simplified in histories and in family stories, still when future generations journey to this holy place, America will not forget.

HONORING JOAQUIN LEGARRETA

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 14, 2000

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a unique American who has served our nation with distinction and honor, Joaquin Legarreta, the Drug Enforcement Agency Deputy Attache for the United States in Mexico.

Mr. Legarreta has served the United States for 30 years in one of the most dangerous jobs we ask our public servants to do, to stand and fight on the front lines of our drug war, one of the great domestic and international policing challenges of the 20th Century, one already following us into the 21st Century. Thanks to men like Joaquin Legarreta, the United States is safer; but he would be the first to tell you that the task of his agency is not yet finished.

He began his service to our country in 1970 with the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, the precursor to today's DEA (the DEA was formed in 1973). His star was already on the rise when he won the prestigious Administrator's Award in 1980, the award that recognizes excellence in agents whose work brings runners, and those for whom they work, to justice.

He won the Administrator's Award in 1980 for the Superfly operation. The DEA caught the Superfly, a ''mother ship'' from Colombia exporting $65,000 pounds of marijuana. A ''mother ship'' sits in international water and distributes its cargo to smaller ships for transport into the United States.

After terms of service that took him to major cities across the Southwest, including Houston, Laredo, El Paso, Brownsville and Sacramento, Legarreta joined the Intelligence Center for DEA, stationed, again, a El Paso. At that point, he began an even more dangerous line of work, work at which he is terribly adept. Today, he is charged with oversight of the DEA regional offices all over Mexico, traveling to them and conducting business on our behalf there.

During the course of his service, he has had numerous contracts put out on his life, a certain indicator that an agent is doing his job above and beyond the call of duty. Once, near the border, he was involved in a shootout in which one of his agents was shot; Legarreta picked him up, put him in the car and drove him to the hospital, saving his life.

He recently told a story that should make all of us proud. In Sacramento, his team executed a search warrant on a drug lab. Afterwards, an agent brought him a woman who had asked to talk to whoever was in charge. Thinking she was upset because flowers had been trampled or a dog kicked, he was overwhelmed when she thanked him for her freedom, and that of her neighbors.

With tears in his eyes, he recanted the story of this small woman with a sweater over her shoulders who grabbed his hand and said, ''Thank you for freeing us.'' She told him that the people in the neighborhood had been prisoners in their own homes because of the drug lab. She wouldn't let go of his hand while they stood together for several minutes.

That, he says, made it all worthwhile. So, while we enjoy our comforts here today, I ask my colleagues to join me in commending this brave and unique patriot on the occasion of his retirement. I also thank his wife, Lupita, and their children, Lorena, Veronica, and Claudia, for sharing their husband and father with our nation.

INTRODUCTION OF A RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 14, 2000

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce a Resolution of Inquiry to have the President direct the Archivist of the United States, the official of the United States Government responsible for coordinating the functions of the Electoral College, to provide the House of Representatives with full and complete information about the preparations that have been made for the various states to carry out the functions of the Electoral College this year.

It is not widely known that the House of Representatives and Senate have a critical role in counting the states' electoral ballots for President and Vice President of the United States. Many know of the ministerial function of the joint session that counts the ballots cast by the electors who are elected in their states. What is not widely understood is the precedent allowing Congress to decide which of two conflicting electoral certificates from a state is valid. Most important is the constitutional function of the Congress to formally object to the counting of the electoral vote or votes of a state and, by a majority of both the House and Senate, to disallow the counting of a state's electoral votes. The House of Representatives should not take this duty lightly, nor should we approach it unprepared.

I want to call attention to the 1961 precedent when a recount of ballots in Hawaii, which was concluded after the governor of that state had certified the election of the Republican slate of electors, showed that the Democratic electors had actually prevailed. The governor sent a second communication that certified that the Democratic slate of electors had been lawfully appointed. Both slates of electors met on the day prescribed by law, cast their votes, and submitted them to the President of the Senate. When the two Houses met in joint session to count the electoral votes, the votes of the electors were presented to the tellers by the Vice President, and, by unanimous consent, the Vice President directed the tellers to accept and count the lawfully appointed slate. Thus, the precedent holds that the Congress has the ability to judge competing claims of electors' votes and to determine which votes are valid.

The rejection of a state's electoral vote or votes is provided by 3 U.S.C. §15. The relevant part reads as follows:

[A]nd no electoral vote or votes from any State which shall have been regularly given by electors whose appointment has been lawfully certified to according to section 6 of this title from which but one return has been

received shall be rejected, but the two Houses concurrently may reject the vote or votes when they agree that such vote or votes have not been so regularly given by electors whose appointment has been so certified.

The only occasion I am aware of when 3 U.S.C. § 15 was brought into play was January 6, 1969. The vote of North Carolina was stated to be 12 for Richard M. Nixon and Spiro T. Agnew and one for George C. Wallace and Curtis E. LeMay. Representative James G. O'Hara of Michigan and Senator Edmund S. Muskie of Maine protested the counting of the vote of North Carolina for Wallace and LeMay as not ''regularly given.''

The joint session then divided, and after the House and Senate individually debated the protest for two hours each, as provided by statute, they each voted to dismiss the objection and the vote for Wallace and LeMay was counted.

The circumstances that challenged the Congress in 1961 and 1969 were certainly different from those that may come to the Capitol doorstep early next year. If there is a single certainty about the election for president in 2000, it is that there is nothing certain. I believe it is in the interest of the members-elect of the 107th Congress that the 106th Congress make preparations for whatever may come to pass. I propose the first step in preparation is to pass a formal resolution of inquiry, which I have proposed today, to have the President direct the Archivist of the United States to provide the House of Representatives with full and complete information about the preparations that agency has coordinated to prepare the Electoral College to complete its constitutional function. We will need that information to know if the functions are faithfully and regularly carried out.

I also have requested the Congressional Research Service to provide information on state laws requiring electors to pledge their support for their political party's nominees for President and Vice President of the United States. Although there is precedent in the House and Senate for accepting the vote of a so-called ''faithless elector,'' as cited in the 1969 instance where a North Carolina elector pledged to Nixon voted for Wallace, that was a case that did not involve state law requiring the faithfulness of electors. There is no precedent for counting or excluding the vote of a ''faithless elector'' when that elector's vote is cast in violation of state law. It is important that we in the House of Representatives have a thorough understanding of state law should such a situation arise in January 2001.

Mr. Speaker, time is of the essence in preparing Congress for counting the electoral votes in January. I urge the expeditious approval of this resolution of inquiry.

ELECTION 2000

HON. CYNTHIA A. McKINNEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 14, 2000

Ms. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely disappointed with events in Florida, but it is important that I bring to your urgent attention, voting difficulties experienced in my District.

In 1996, there was heavy voter turnout in the Fourth Congressional District. The heavy turnout was responsible for sending me back to Congress after an unfriendly redistricting fight. However, at that time, voters were forced to wait for hours in order to cast their vote. Too many of them had to stand outside in the weather because the polling places were cramped and too small to accommodate the large number of voters who showed up to vote. People were standing outside and in some cases the lines extended down the street. We all were very proud to have excited the electorate to vote. However, that experience should have alerted the planners of our elections of the need for adequate facilities for voting; apparently it did not.

Regrettably, the electoral process in the Fourth Congressional District was once again marred by exactly the same logistical difficulties as were experienced in 1996, only this year they were even worse. From election day continuing through today, my office has received phone calls from constituents saying that they experienced excessively long delays in voting, some having to wait as long as five hours, and even worse, many said that they left the polling station without having voted at all. In stark contrast, I am told that the polling stations in the northern precincts of the district, which are majority white, moved quickly (in some cases in as little as 15 minutes) and voters did not experience any where near the difficulties experienced by black voters in the southern part of the District. I am concerned that we might be seeing a new pattern and practice that has black voter suppression as its intent.

Complaints in my district are rampant, and I've heard similar complaints from other parts of my State. I don't want to place blame on any of the innocent election workers whose task it was to service large numbers of voters under severe circumstances. In large measure, they did an admiral job under the circumstances. But the right to vote in this country is sacrosanct and that right should be protected. I am calling on the Department of Justice to investigate what happened in my district because sophisticated black voter suppression is still black voter suppression and that's against the law.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 9, 2000.

Hon. WILLIAM CLINTON,
President, Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT CLINTON: I am extremely disappointed to have to write this letter to you today. But in light of events in Florida, I think it is important that I bring to your urgent attention, voting difficulties experienced in Georgia's Fourth Congressional District.

In 1996, there was heavy voter turnout in the Fourth Congressional District. I am pleased about that. The heavy turnout was responsible for sending me back to Congress, Max Cleland to the Senate, and you to the White House. However, at that time, voters were forced to wait for hours in order to cast their vote. Too many of them had to stand outside in the weather because the polling place was cramped and too small to accommodate the large number of voters who showed up to cast their vote. People were standing outside and in some cases the lines extended down the street. We all were very proud to have excited the electorate to vote. However, that experience should have alerted the planners of our elections here of the need for adequate facilities for voting; apparently it did not.

We worked very hard this year to encourage all the voters in the district to participate in the November 7th election and as a consequence, there was once again a strong turnout. Regrettably, the electoral process in the Fourth Congressional District was once again marred by exactly the same logistical difficulties as were experienced in 1996, only this year they were worse. From election day continuing to today, my office and the DeKalb County NAACP have received countless phone calls from constituents complained saying that they experienced excessively long delays in voting, some having to wait as long as four to five hours, and even worse, many said that they had left the polling station without having voted at all. These constituents complained that the polling stations were completely underprepared for the turnout. There were simply too few voting booths, voter lists, and elections personnel at the black precincts in the Fourth Congressional District. In stark contrast, I am told that the polling stations in the northern precincts of the district, which are majority white, moved quickly (in some cases in as little as 15 minutes) and voters did not experience any where near the difficulties experienced by black voters in the southern part of the District.

By way of example, constituents complained that at Stone View precinct, there were at least 1200 people standing in line waiting to vote, but election officials confided that they could process only approximately 100 voters an hour and that at that rate voters would be voting until 8:00 a.m. the following morning. Hundreds of people eventually left the precinct without voting after having waited four to five hours to vote. Additionally, we received complaints that constituents waited as long as four to five hours in line only to be told when they finally arrived at the desk that they were at the wrong precinct and because of the lateness of the hour, they were not going to be able to vote at all.

Tragically, many of the people waiting in line to vote were forced to stand for hours in the rain with infants and young children. One constituent complained that after he had waited for hours to get his ballot form at the front desk, he was not allowed reentry into the building when he left the voting line to check on his small children who were outside. Also, several motor vehicle accidents occurred at polling stations, in large measure I am sure, because of the voting delays leading to traffic congestion at the polls.

In light of the above, I am extremely concerned that a new form of black voter suppression might have been experienced by voters in the Fourth Congressional District, constituting a potential violation of the Voting Rights Act.

Mr. President, I do not want to place blame on any of the innocent election workers whose task it was to service large numbers of voters under severe circumstances. In large measure, they did an admirable job under the circumstances. But the right to vote in this country is sacrosanct and that right should be protected.

I respectfully request your immediate investigation into this matter.

Sincerely,

CYNTHIA McKINNEY,
Member of Congress.