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.