

that builds on Medicare's strengths and ensures its solvency for decades ahead.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATKINS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WATKINS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. KELLY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. DELAURO addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. NAPOLITANO addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### 2000 CENSUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues only have to look at the history of the issue of the census to understand what is going on in the House this Congress. Tomorrow, we will begin the debate on the supplemental appropriations bill for the Wye River Peace Accord and the victims of Hurricane Mitch.

Just 2 years ago, we were debating another supplemental appropriations bill. Then it was for flood victims in the Midwest. The waters in North Dakota had not yet receded when the Republican majority added language to ban the use of modern scientific methods to the flood relief bill. They thought the President would not dare veto flood relief over the census, particularly when so many people were suffering. They were wrong.

The President vetoed the bill, stating very strongly that Congress had no

business tying flood relief to anti-modern scientific counts in the census. The President received editorial support clear across this Nation, and the Republican majority backed down.

Then, in September of 1997, the majority put language in the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill to ban the use of modern scientific methods. When the President threatened to veto that, the majority knew they did not dare shut down the government over the census, so they came to the bargaining table with 17 pages of language designed to tie the Census Bureau up in knots.

The majority insisted on language that required two sets of numbers for the 2000 census. Now they say that two sets of numbers is irresponsible. They set up a monitoring board with a \$4 million budget and complained when the President insisted that the board be balanced with an equal number of presidential appointments and congressional appointments.

The majority tried again in 1998 to kill the use of modern scientific methods and failed. Then they turned to the courts. In January they lost that battle, too. The Supreme Court ruled that the Census Bureau could not use modern scientific methods for apportionment, but they are required to use it for everything else, if feasible. Of course, what the majority really cared about was keeping the Census Bureau from producing census counts that were corrected for those missed and counted twice.

Now they are desperate again. They claim that apportioning the 435 seats among the States is the same thing as drawing Congressional District boundaries, even though apportionment is done by the Congress and drawing district lines is done by the State legislatures. In fact, the last time the Republicans controlled Congress during the census was 1920, and they so disliked the results of that census that they refused to reapportion the House for the entire decade.

The fight today is about whether or not the professionals at the Census Bureau will be allowed to conduct the census as they see fit. The majority has introduced seven bills that look harmless on the surface but most of them are designed to make it more difficult for the professionals to do an accurate count.

Several of the bills are so invasive that the Census Bureau director said that the effect, and I am quoting Dr. Prewitt now, the Director of the Census Bureau, he claimed it would be "just short of disastrous." He said, "It would put the entire census at risk".

Several are so bad that the Secretary of Commerce said that he would recommend a presidential veto. None of their proposals would make the census any more accurate. And I will insert at this point in the RECORD the letter from Secretary of Commerce Daley to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,  
Washington, DC, March 16, 1999.

Hon. DAN BURTON,  
Chairman, Committee on Government Reform,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BURTON: Tomorrow, the Government Reform Committee is scheduled to mark up seven bills related to the conduct of the Decennial Census in 2000. While I know we share a common goal of ensuring that Census 2000 is the most accurate and cost-effective Decennial possible, the Department of Commerce must strongly oppose legislation that would mandate a post census local review, require the printing of short census forms in 34 languages, and mandate a second mailing of census forms.

According to the Director of the Census Bureau, Kenneth Prewitt, and the professionals at the Census Bureau, these three bills would reduce the accuracy and seriously disrupt the schedule of Census 2000. Based on the attached detailed analysis of the legislation provided by Dr. Prewitt, if this legislation were presented to the President, I would recommend that he veto it.

The Census Bureau is already working on many of the issues that these and the other four bills address. For example, the Census Bureau is not designed to manage a grant program, but it is working to increase partnerships with local governments and tribal and non-profit organizations to increase participation in Census 2000. In addition, we expect to seek additional funding for a variety of other activities. And we would appreciate assistance in making it possible for more individuals to take temporary census jobs without losing their government benefits.

Thank you for this opportunity to present our views on the legislation under consideration by your Committee. I look forward to continuing to work with you and other members of Congress to ensure that Census 2000 is the most accurate census possible.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. DALEY.

Mr. Speaker, the 1990 census was the first census to be less accurate than the one before it. There were 8.4 million people missed and 4.4 million people were counted twice. The 1990 census missed 1 in 10 African American males, 1 in 20 Latinos, 1 in 8 American Indians on reservations, and 1 in 16 rural non-Hispanic whites. The sole focus of the majority's agenda is to make sure that these people are left out of the next census as well.

When the Constitution was written, there was a shameful compromise to the count. African Americans were counted as three-fifths of a person. We must not allow the 2000 census to count African American males as nine-tenths of a person.

There is one clear and simple issue here. Will the next census count everyone or will it repeat the mistakes of 1990, leaving millions of people unrepresented and unfairly left out?

The census is tied to not only accurate data but our funding formulas are tied to it. The census plan that the Census Bureau has put forward, using modern scientific counts, is supported by the entire scientific community.

These are the people that support statistical methods in the Census 2000: The National Academy of Sciences; the American Statistical Association; the Council of Professional Associates on Federal Statistics. Dr. Barbara

BRYANT, a Republican, President Bush's Census Bureau Director. She speaks out every day for a modern scientific count. The American Sociological Association; the National Association of Business Economists; the Association of University Business and Economic Research; the Association of Public Data Users; and the Consortium of Social Science Associates.

These professionals versus the Republican majority.

We have a number of important Members of Congress that are participating in this special order tonight, and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. ELIJAH CUMMINGS) is first, but I really would like to put in one of the recent editorials that have come out across the Nation regarding the GOP plan to undermine the census with this bill that they have before us.

I would like to just quote one line out of it. And this is from the Washington Post. This editorial is entitled "Census Chicken": "House Republicans are playing an indefensible game of chicken with the next census. To prevent the publication of accurate figures, which they fear could cost them seats in the next redistricting, they are threatening steps that could disrupt the entire operation. They put themselves in an untenable position reminiscent of their amateurish threat of several years ago to shut down the government unless they got their way."

This editorial goes on. It is quite a lengthy one. Again, they say, "So some Republicans also are trying, in the name of greater accuracy, no less, to impose new requirements on the Census Bureau whose effect would be to delay publication of the adjusted numbers until after redistricting had safely begun." And it ends by saying, "They ought to back off."

Mr. Speaker, I will submit at this point for the RECORD the entire editorial.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 15, 1999]

#### CENSUS CHICKEN

House Republicans are playing an indefensible game of chicken with the next census. To prevent the publication of accurate figures, which they fear could cost them seats in the next redistricting, they are threatening steps that could disrupt the entire operation. They put themselves in an untenable position, reminiscent of their amateurish threat of several years ago to shut down the government unless they got their way on the budget. The carried that threat out, much to their chagrin. Their leaders—or some of their sensible members; it doesn't take that many in the House these days—should save them from suffering a similar embarrassment this time.

The issue is whether and how to correct for the chronic undercount, of low-income people and minority groups especially, that has come to plague the census as it has become better understood in recent decades. Disproportionate numbers of such people tend to be missed in the traditional head count, conducted first by mail, then by knocking on doors. The administration proposes, with the overwhelming support of the statistics profession, to use a system of sampling—extrapolation from exhaustive counts in selected census tracts—to adjust for this.

The Republicans seek to block that, on grounds it is little more than sophisticated guesswork, illegal, subject to political manipulation—and, in their view, likely to benefit Democrats. Last year they sought to enlist the courts. The Supreme Court found the law to be mixed. It agreed that an actual count had to be used for apportionment of congressional seats among the states, and the bureau has had to adjust its plan accordingly. There will be more of a head count and less reliance on sampling; the White House is still trying to figure out how to fit the additional cost of perhaps \$2 billion within the president's budget. The court also said, however, that adjusted figures are required to be used for most other purposes, including, in most cases, the allocation of federal funds. It left up in the air which set of figures should be used for redistricting within states.

The administration's goal is to publish both sets by the spring of 2001, when redistricting is supposed to begin, and let each state choose which to use, since redistricting is a state function. The Republicans have threatened to withhold appropriations to prevent this, but that can get them back into the business of shutting down part of the government if the president makes good, as he should, on his own threat to use the veto. Nor may a vote whose clear effect would be to deny full political representation to significant numbers of vulnerable people be a comfortable one to cast.

So some Republicans also are trying—in the name of greater accuracy, no less—to impose new requirements on the Census Bureau whose effect would be to delay publication of the adjusted numbers until after redistricting had safely begun. Delay might serve their purpose as well as prohibition, at less political cost. The bureau says on the basis of long experience that the most important of these proposals—a second mailing and an additional chance for local officials to appeal the results of the head count—would actually detract from accuracy, innocuous though they sound. Director Kenneth Prewitt recently testified that they "would disrupt and even place at risk Census 2000."

The Republicans are contemplating mounting a national ad campaign in behalf of their position. But it's an unworthy cause. Nor is it clear to us that, in the complicated business of redistricting, the adjusted figures even if states choose to use them would necessarily work to Republican disadvantage. They ought to back off.

Mr. Speaker, I now call upon my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me, and also thank her for her work with regard to this issue. The gentlewoman has definitely been at the forefront of this very important fight.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support an accurate and fair Census 2000. Experts at the Census Bureau have concluded that only by using modern scientific methods for the census can we achieve this result.

I urge my colleagues to be mindful that conducting an accurate census is a complex task. The 1990 census was inundated with millions of errors, resulting in an error rate of over 10 percent. Approximately 101,000 Maryland residents were missed. Moreover, it is estimated that almost 21,000 constituents of the 7th Congressional District of Maryland were undercounted. This means that 21,000 of my constituents

were not included in decisions made by the State and local governments that directly impact their lives, including the planning of schools, child care facilities, and the distribution of funds for health care. This is unacceptable and must be remedied.

However, the answer is not H.R. 472, the Post Census Local Review Act. This bill requires the Census Bureau to set aside 9 unnecessary weeks after the field work is done to review the count of local addresses a second time.

A local census review was conducted in 1990, and most mayors who participated in the program thought it was a disaster. Further, it would consume so much time that the Census Bureau would be unable to carry out its plans to use the more appropriate scientific manner to count our citizens.

Because of these concerns, when the bill is considered on the floor tomorrow I intend to support a substitute offered by my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN MALONEY), which will involve local governments in various aspects of the count, while also allowing the Census Bureau to proceed with its established plans.

As lawmakers, we have an obligation to focus on the impact the census data has on every aspect of our constituents' lives: education, health, transportation and economic development. As such, I believe the task of providing an accurate and complete census is better left to the statistical experts with guidance from the Congress and not its micromanagement.

I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I yield back to her.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his important comments.

It is important to remember that the census has real impact on people's lives. Information gathered in the census is used by States and local governments to plan schools and highways, by the Federal Government to distribute funds for health care and all other government programs, and by businesses in making their economic plans and predicting the future.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CARRIE MEEK) is here to comment. We had a public hearing, actually, in her city, which she hosted for the Subcommittee on the Census of the Committee on Government Reform. If I remember correctly, everyone testified in support of modern scientific methods.

□ 2130

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, yes, they did. I want to thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) who has worked so hard and assiduously toward making us have a fair and accurate count. She has done this against many odds and against much fight from the Republican party.

I want to call to the attention of everyone and to this country that it appears that the Republicans would use

any tactic necessary to dismantle the Census Department's ability to reach a fair and accurate count. It appears that they want to prevent an accurate census, not to get an accurate one. They have given much lip service to this, but all their efforts show that they are using all kinds of tactics to come up with ways to dismantle an accurate count.

History has shown us that the 1970 and the 1990 count in the census undercounted minorities. They undercounted African Americans, and they undercounted Hispanics. This chart shows this: More blacks than non-blacks were missed in the census. And we look at this and we can see here in 1940, also in 1950, 1960, 1970, 1980, 1990, we will see that a high percentage of African Americans have been missed. About 4.4 percent of African Americans were missed in the last census. That is a bad undercount. It takes away from African Americans their ability to be counted as a whole American.

Our chairwoman, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), mentioned that. If we remember, the Constitution once had us counted as three-fifths of a man. And now that we are supposed to be counted as one person, there still is an undercount. I want to thank the gentlewoman for her efforts on that behalf.

The Secretary of Commerce mentioned in his report that the 1990 census was the first in 50 years that was less accurate than its predecessor. The undercount of minorities was much worse than the 1.6 national average.

What I see here is sort of an intramural fight between the Census Department and the Republican Party, and it should not be that way. Democrats are trying very hard to make this census accurate, to be sure that everyone is counted. So, then, if that is our mandate as elected officials, there are some people who do not feel that an accurate count is very vital. But it is very vital.

Last year's census data was used in the distribution of over \$180 billion in Federal aid. Republicans know this. I do not understand why they are fighting an accurate count when they know the very people they represent will be undercut or hurt by an inaccurate count. The poor people, the disenfranchised people, the homeless people, the elderly people, veterans, everyone will pay when the census is not accurate.

So I do not understand what the thinking is in the Republican Party that lets us worry only about the Congress and its apportionment. So that is all they are worried about? If that is the case, then that says to the people back home that they are not worried about them, they are not worried about the quality of their lives, because what they want to do is be sure that they do not bring any more Democrats into the Congress. Well, that is not fair to these senior citizens back home. It is not fair to people who are relying on govern-

ment for all of the benefits that they should receive.

All we are asking for is that local communities receive their fair share of Federal spending. Without an accurate count, they will not get their fair share. An inaccurate count will shortchange the affected communities for an entire decade. They have already been shortchanged by the 1970 census, again in 1990. So here we come again. The Republicans are saying, "We do not care." They can be shortchanged for 10 more years, another decade of undercutting people who need a fair share.

On January 25, 1999, the United States Supreme Court ruled that the Census Act prohibits the use of sampling for apportioning congressional districts among the States. I do not agree with the Supreme Court on that. We did not win that fight. But they were wrong.

However, the Court also held that the 1976 revisions to the Census Act required the use of sampling for all other purposes, including the distribution of Federal aid to States and municipalities and for redistricting, if the Secretary of Commerce determines its use to be feasible.

I just left members of the Florida legislature. I attended a summit there. The whole talk was the census, getting an accurate count. Florida is one of the States that had an undercount. We do not expect to have that undercount again. I hope the Republicans will understand that Florida is a crucial State. We have people in that State who demand to be treated fairly.

The Secretary of Commerce has already announced that he considers the use of sampling to be feasible. Given the Supreme Court's ruling, a 2000 census plan, then, must be a two-numbered plan that uses traditional counting methods to arrive at a number for apportionment and modern statistical techniques for all other purposes.

My colleague from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) has really pushed this point home to everyone, the fact that statistical sampling is a technique that we need for all other purposes. Otherwise we are saying from the very beginning we do not want an accurate count. We want guesswork to get it down. Not only do we want guesswork, but we do not want some people to be counted. We do not care if they are not counted.

The Census Bureau has announced new details in their plan for a complete census under the law. This plan will produce counts using modern methods that will correct for people missed and counted twice and be used for all purposes other than apportionment. However, without using those modern methods, the 2000 census will have the same errors that the 1990 census had and will miss millions of people, mostly poor minorities, in this Nation.

Republicans are now trying to legislate through a series of bills and acts and resolutions. What they are doing is, they are trying to legislate a faulty census. Why is it needed through legis-

lation? Why cannot we depend upon the Census Bureau?

The time for legislating how the census should be conducted has passed. The Census Bureau must be allowed to focus on conducting the census as planned and modified by the Supreme Court's decision. Let us allow the professionals at the Census Bureau to do their jobs and produce a fair and equitable Census 2000 count.

I want to assure and say to our chairwoman, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), that we are going to continue to work on this, we are going to continue to spread the word that there are people here in this Congress who do not feel that all of us count. And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that we do count and we will be counted.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure that the gentlewoman knows that H.R. 472 has been pulled from the floor agenda for tomorrow. It will not be on the floor tomorrow. And this is very good because, as the gentlewoman pointed out and as the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) pointed out, it does absolutely nothing to correct the undercount. It does not do anything to correct the mistakes of the last census and, according to the professionals at the Census Bureau, puts hurdles and red tape in front of it that makes it impossible it get an accurate count.

So we are fortunate that the Republican Party has not put it on the floor for tomorrow, and I hope that they will not ever put it on the floor, since it does not do anything to help get an accurate count.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include for the RECORD an editorial from the home city of the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK), the Miami Herald, from March 22nd. It is entitled "Everyone Counts. Republicans Will Prevent An Accurate Census At Any Cost."

And to read just a small portion from it, "U.S. House should remove the barriers to statistical sampling." The editorial goes on. "If you are black, Hispanic, Asian or poor, live in the city or on city streets and have a mind to be distrustful, you might conclude that many Republicans in Congress just want you to go away, at least until the 2000 census count is over and the new congressional district lines are drawn.

"Quite unreasonable has been the Republican congressional majority's attempts to thwart an honest count."

It states that "The House Government Reform Committee voted last week to throw as many monkey wrenches as needed into next year's count with bills that would delay a true count until the new district lines are drawn. In other words, delay it until all those initially overlooked black, brown and other minority faces no longer count."

Mr. Speaker, I include the following editorial for the RECORD:

[From the Miami Herald, Mar. 22, 1999]

EVERYONE COUNTS: REPUBLICANS WILL PREVENT AN ACCURATE CENSUS AT ANY COST  
U.S. House should remove the barriers to statistical sampling.

If you are black, Hispanic, Asian or poor, live in the city or on city streets and have a mind to be distrustful, you might conclude that many Republicans in Congress just want you to go away—at least until the 2000 Census count is over and the new congressional districts are drawn.

These Republicans—and South Florida Reps. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen and Lincoln Diaz-Balart are among them—apparently fear that if these minorities are counted, the Democrats will gain more seats come redistricting time. It's a reasonable, albeit political, fear.

Quite unreasonable has been the Republican congressional majority's attempts to thwart an honest count. Last year, the party restricted Census Bureau funding and went to the Supreme Court to outlaw the use of statistical sampling, which would result in a more-accurate count. There, they got a partial win—sampling cannot be used for apportioning House seats.

But they aren't content to leave it at that. The shame of it is that Rep. Ros-Lehtinen and Diaz-Balart are in the thick of this misguided effort, even though theirs were among the top 25 undercounted districts in the country in 1990. Why is this important? Because government aid is tied to population counts. So their constituents lost federal funds because of it. Why do they want their constituents cheated again?

Government Reform Committee voted to throw as many monkey wrenches as needed into next year's count with bills that would delay a true count until the new district lines are drawn. In other words, delay it until all those initially overlooked black, brown and other minority faces no longer count.

One bill mandates a second mailing of census questionnaires to all households that don't respond, even though census workers will phone and visit each of those homes anyway.

A second measure, seemingly innocuous, would allow skeptical municipalities to demand that the Census Bureau come back after the count and recount the number of households—not the people—in a given area. The idea is that there may be discrepancies between the local address lists and the bureau's.

That's unlikely to happen. So says Barbara Everitt Bryant, director of the Census Bureau from 1989 to 1993. She headed the 1990 count under President George Bush—a Republican administration. After that count, some of the cities protested so loudly that the bureau sent interviewers to recanvass. Less than one-tenth of 1 percent of new households were uncovered—at a cost of \$10 million.

The 2000 count will be even-more accurate because a change in the law lets cities and the bureau share address data to make sure questionnaires don't go to vacant lots. Yet this recount could take months.

When these bills get to the House, common sense must trump partisan politics.

Otherwise, it will be clear who really counts in the GOP's America—and who doesn't.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), a member of the Subcommittee on the Census, who has been a truly outstanding leader on this issue, and I thank him for joining us as he has so

many times on the floor to speak up for accuracy and fairness.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I also want to echo the sentiments of those who have already praised the outstanding leadership that she provided on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join in this important special order, which I suggest is dedicated to democracy, fairness, equity, and representation for all of the people in this Nation. The issue, obviously, to which I am referring is the year 2000 census.

As a member of the Subcommittee on the Census, I submit that this is one of the most important issues of this Congress. This is not a new issue. In fact, it dates back some 2000 years, when a decree went out from Caesar Augustus that a census must be taken of all the inhabited earth.

Also, it is written in the Book of Numbers that the Lord God spoke to Moses in the wilderness of Sinai and told him to take a census of the sons of Israel. And of course if it was today, he would have said the sons and daughters of Israel. It was just that important 2000 years ago, and certainly it is that important today.

Since 1790, during the first census there was a significant undercount, especially among the poor and disenfranchised, and of course we have heard how African Americans were counted as only three-fifths of a person. Now, here we are 200 years later, in the 1990s, and it is estimated that the census missed over 8 million people. Most of those not counted were poor people living in inner cities and rural communities, African Americans, Latinos, immigrants, and children. The City of Chicago, my city, had an undercount of about 2.4 percent, and the African American undercount in that city was between 5 and 6 percent.

Obviously, we cannot afford to have a count in the year 2000 that does not include every American citizen. Too much is at stake. The census count determines who receives billions of Federal dollars. Every year census information directs an estimated \$170 billion in Federal spending. Census data helps determine where the money goes for better roads, transit systems, schools, senior citizens' centers, health care facilities, programs for Head Start, school lunches.

In addition to money, representation is at stake, and in a democracy representation is just as important as the money. Congress, State legislatures, city councils, county boards, and other political subdivisions are redrawn as a result of the census count.

There are some in this body and some in this country who would deny representation and resources to millions of citizens in the name of maintaining the status quo. It is unfortunate that we might ever consider a bill that purports to move us in the direction of a more accurate census when we know that that bill will do just the opposite.

□ 2145

I urge my colleagues not to play games with people's representation and resources. One begins to wonder whether initiatives counterproductive to an accurate census are part of a larger plan to delay, distort and ultimately destroy the accuracy of the 2000 census.

Under the Census Bureau's plan, everybody counts. All Americans would be included in the census. If we keep taking the census the old way, we will obviously miss millions of people, which would cause one to wonder if we have learned anything since 1790. Our scientific information dictates that we use proven scientific efforts to maximize the accuracy of the census. All of the experts know that it is what works.

Mr. Speaker, as we move to the actuality of census taking, there are bills that have been put before us supposedly designed to improve accuracy. But in reality, it seems to me that what we are doing is putting partisan politics ahead of the people and fair representation. It is my position that you can take all of these bills, apply them on top of a flawed census plan, and you end up with a flawed census. It is like saying that you really cannot get blood out of a turnip. You can take it and dice it and splice it. You can puree it and saute it, you can skew it, you can stew it, but you still will end up with turnip juice. I am afraid that that is how we are going to end up. If we do not use the most scientific method to count all of the people, I am afraid that we are going to miss people and rather than an accurate census, turnip juice will be the result of our efforts.

I thank the gentlewoman and again commend her for her outstanding leadership.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentleman for his most accurate statements and descriptive statements. We are not about turnip juice, as he says, we are about accuracy, and our goal is the most accurate census possible, completed using the most up-to-date methods as recommended by the National Academy of Sciences and the vast majority of the professional scientific community. We should be supporting science, not trying to undermine it and get a less accurate count.

I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Gonzalez) for joining us. I had the great honor of serving with his father. He was dedicated to civil rights, was very proud of his role in it, and I think it is very appropriate that his son is here to speak on what has been called by many civil rights leaders the civil rights issue of this decade, making sure that all Americans, every single one of them, is counted with the most modern scientific methods.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for allowing me this opportunity, and I also join my colleagues in commending her for the leadership role that she has played in this important battle.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in hopes that history will not repeat itself, in hopes that we have learned by our previous mistakes. That is what we teach our children, that is what we have been taught. You would think as leaders, elected by our constituencies, we come here today with those important lessons. That may not be the case.

In the 1990 census, there were 26 million errors, approximately 8.4 million people were missed, 4.4 million were counted twice, and another 13 million were counted in the wrong place. Of those minorities, as has already been pointed out, those were minorities, they were children, they were poor people in the rural areas that had the highest undercounts. Clearly, we can do better than that. We must do better than that if we are to truly represent Americans of all ages and colors.

In Texas alone, we had an undercount of nearly half a million people, and it cost our State \$1 billion in Federal funds. That is \$1 billion of our tax money. Estimates suggest that an equally inaccurate undercount in 2000 would cost Texas over \$2 billion.

I have already heard from several mayors in Texas, including the mayors of San Antonio, Laredo, Brownsville, Houston and Austin. They know what the 1990 census cost Texas and they are desperate to avoid another undercount. Even my local newspaper, the San Antonio Express News, has joined this all too important debate, requesting of Governor George W. Bush, Jr. to take a stand for Texas on the census and to allow and make sure that we utilize the latest proven, reliable scientific methods in arriving at an accurate count.

In 2000, the Census Bureau will have to count 275 million people at 120 million addresses. We are just over a year away from the first census 2000 mailing, and we must allow the Census Bureau to get on with their business, counting the American population.

H.R. 472, the Local Census Quality Check Act, scheduled at one time to come up on the House floor this week, would require the Census Bureau to conduct post-census local reviews. Now, that sounds like a good idea. But when you look under the cover, it appears to me that the real goal of H.R. 472 is to postpone deadlines while making it impossible for the Census Bureau to use scientific methods to arrive at the most accurate count possible.

Dr. Kenneth Prewitt, the director of the Census Bureau, has stated that H.R. 472 would mandate an operational change to the census 2000 plan which is neither timely, effective nor cost efficient and would return us to inadequate 1990 operations that have now been substantially improved upon. It is simple. Post-census local review is not a new idea. The Census Bureau has used it in the past. They used it in 1990 and it proved to be inefficient.

With that experience in mind, the Census Bureau developed a new plan for the 2000 census which would address

the issue of local participation while utilizing modern scientific methods to produce the most accurate census possible.

I support the Maloney amendment to H.R. 472 which allows the Census Bureau to do just that, address local participation and use proven statistical methods to produce the most accurate census possible. The Maloney amendment gives local governments the power to add new construction to the census address list, review counts of vacant addresses and to review jurisdictional boundaries as part of a local update of census addresses before the census is conducted and not after.

It is clear to me that this amendment not only includes local governments in the census process, it makes them an integral part of it by including them in the process of building and checking the address list on a timely basis. After all, if what we all want is for our local governments to have some participation and some control or simply some say in the process, let us include them now and not later.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully would request that the following letters from mayors in Texas who support local participation but oppose H.R. 472 be submitted into the RECORD.

CITY OF SAN ANTONIO,  
HOWARD W. PEAK, MAYOR,  
March 16, 1999.

Hon. DAN BURTON,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BURTON: I am writing you to request your support for a fair and accurate census in 2000. As you are well aware, the 1990 census resulted in 26 million errors and an undercount of more than eight million Americans. With more than 38,000 citizens not counted in San Antonio and close to half a million statewide, Texas trailed only California as the state with the highest undercount in the 1990 census.

On behalf of the City of San Antonio, I am requesting you to oppose H.R. 472, the Local Census Quality Check Act. While I am favor in local participation and involvement to ensure a quality census, the effect of this legislation would prevent the Census Bureau from utilizing the most effective scientific methods for ensuring an accurate census. Furthermore, the Act jeopardizes the ability of the Census Bureau to correct census counts for persons missed or counted twice by requiring that the 9-week local review process begin after all other census activities are completed. The Census Bureau abandoned the post-census local review process because it was found not to be cost-effective.

As currently drafted, H.R. 472 undermines the goal local officials have been working towards—the most accurate census possible. Therefore, I support the amendment proposed by Representative Carolyn Maloney which would coordinate local review with the other census activities. San Antonio and the entire state of Texas stand to lose billions of dollars in federal funds allocated on the basis of the census. The only way we can assure a fair and an accurate census is to allow the professionals at the Census Bureau to make the many critical decisions involved in taking a census based on their expertise and experience.

I ask for your commitment for a fair and accurate census in 2000. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,  
HOWARD W. PEAK,  
Mayor.

CITY OF LAREDO,  
ELIZABETH G. FLORES, MAYOR,  
March 22, 1999.

Hon. HENRY A. WAXMAN,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
House Government Oversight Committee,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WAXMAN: I am writing to ask you to join us in supporting a fair and accurate census in the year 2000. Twenty-six million errors and an undercount of more than eight million Americans is not acceptable. Especially since most of the Americans who were not counted were children, poor people and minorities. As elected officials, we have a duty to protect the interests of our constituents. It is incumbent upon us to ensure that they are treated fairly and counted equally.

With more than 23,000 not counted in Laredo and close to half a million Texans not counted in the 1990 census, Texas trailed only California as the state with the highest undercount. This undercount denied Texas \$1 billion in federal funds. If we chose not to correct the egregious mistakes made in the last census, Texas stands to lose an additional \$2.18 billion in population-based federal funds. As Mayor of Laredo, I must look out for what is best for the citizens of this City. A fair and accurate census is at the forefront of my agenda.

I am also writing to request that you oppose H.R. 472, the Local Census Quality Check Act. While I am in favor in local participation and involvement to ensure a quality census, the effect of this legislation would prevent the Census Bureau from utilizing the most effective scientific methods for ensuring an accurate census.

According to current law, the census must begin on April 1, 2000, and report final population counts by April 1, 2001. On April 1, 2000, the census takers must assign 275 million people to 120 million addresses. This calls for the largest peacetime mobilization in our country. The Local Census Quality Check Act jeopardizes the ability of the Census Bureau to correct census counts for persons missed or counted twice by requiring that the 9-week local review process begin after all other census activities are completed. In addition, the post-census local review was found not to be cost-effective. For these reasons, the Census Bureau abandoned the post-census local review process.

I believe that we should be able to have both local involvement and the use of the best methods to assure that all people are counted. I support the efforts of Representative Carolyn Maloney to alter H.R. 472. Representative Maloney's amendment will address the problems raised by some local governments, of new construction and boundary errors in a manner that allows the Census Bureau to coordinate local review with all of the other activities that must take place within a limited amount of time.

As currently drafted, H.R. 472 undermines the goal local officials have been working towards, the most accurate census possible. Laredo and the entire State of Texas stand to lose billions of dollars in federal funds allocated on the basis of the census. The census is a complex undertaking. The only way we can assure a fair and accurate census is to allow the professionals at the Census Bureau to make the many critical decisions involved in taking a census based on their expertise and experience. I ask for your commitment for a fair and accurate census in 2000.

Warmest Regards!  
Sincerely,

ELIZABETH F. FLORES.

CITY OF AUSTIN,  
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,  
Austin, TX, March 23, 1999.

Hon. HENRY A. WAXMAN,  
*U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WAXMAN: I am writing you to request your support for a fair and accurate census in 2000. As you are well aware, the 1990 census resulted in 26 million errors and an undercount of more than eight million Americans. With thousands of citizens not counted in Austin and close to half a million statewide, Texas trailed only California as the state with the highest undercount in the 1990 census.

On behalf of the City of Austin, I am requesting you to oppose H.R. 472, the Local Census Quality Check Act. While I am in favor of local participation and involvement to ensure a quality census, the effect of this legislation would prevent the Census Bureau from utilizing the most effective scientific methods for ensuring an accurate census. Furthermore, the Act jeopardizes the ability of the Census Bureau to correct census counts for persons missed or counted twice by requiring that the 9-week local review process begin after all other census activities are completed. The Census Bureau abandoned the post-census local review process because it was found not to be cost-effective.

As currently drafted, H.R. 472 undermines the goal local officials have been working on to get the most accurate census possible. Therefore, I support the amendment proposed by Representative Carolyn Maloney which would coordinate local review with the other census activities. Austin and the entire state of Texas stand to lose billions of dollars in federal funds allocated on the basis of the census. The only way we can assure a fair and an accurate census is to allow the professionals at the Census Bureau to make the many critical decisions involved in taking a census based on their expertise and experience.

I ask for your commitment for a fair and accurate census in 2000. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

KIRK WATSON,  
*Mayor.*

CITY OF HOUSTON,  
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,  
Houston, TX, March 16, 1999.

Congressman HENRY A. WAXMAN,  
Congressman DAN BURTON,  
*U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Government Reform, Washington, DC.*

DEAR GENTLEMEN: I write to ask you to join us in supporting a fair and accurate census in 2000. As you are well aware, the 1990 census resulted in 26 million errors and an undercount of more than eight million Americans. Most of the Americans who were not counted were children, poor people and minorities. As elected officials we have a duty to protect the interests of our constituents. It is incumbent upon us to ensure that they are treated fairly and counted equally.

With more than 66,000 not counted in Houston and close to half a million Texans not counted in the 1990 census. Texas trailed only California as the state with the highest undercount. This undercount denied Texas \$1 billion in federal funds. If we choose not to correct the egregious mistakes made in the last census, Texas stands to lose an additional \$2.18 billion in population-based federal funds. As Mayor of Houston I must look out for what is best for the citizens of this city. We must serve our constituents and demand a fair and accurate census. A fair and

accurate census is at the forefront of my agenda.

I am also writing to request that you oppose H.R. 472, the Local Census Quality Check Act. While I am in favor of local participation and involvement to ensure a quality census, the effect of this legislation would prevent the Census Bureau from utilizing the most effective scientific methods for ensuring an accurate census. According to current law, the census must begin on April 1, 2000, and report final population counts by April 1, 2001. On April 1, 2000, the census takers must assign 275 million people to 120 million addresses. This calls for the largest peacetime mobilization in our country. The Local Census Quality Check Act jeopardizes the ability of the Census Bureau to correct census counts for persons missed or counted twice by requiring that the 9-week local review process begin after all other census activities are completed. In addition, the post-census local review was found not to be cost-effective. For these reasons, the Census Bureau abandoned the post-census local review process.

I believe that we should be able to have both local involvement and the use of the best methods to assure that all people are counted. I support the efforts of Representative Carolyn Maloney to alter H.R. 472. Representative Maloney's amendment will address the problems raised by some local governments, of new construction and boundary errors in a manner that allows the Census Bureau to coordinate local review with all of the other activities that must take place within a limited amount of time.

As currently drafted, H.R. 472 undermines the goal local officials have been working towards—the most accurate census possible. Houston and the entire state of Texas stand to lose billions of dollars in federal funds allocated on the basis of the census. The census is a complex undertaking. The only way we can assure a fair and an accurate census is to allow the professionals at the Census Bureau to make the many critical decisions involved in taking a census based on their expertise and experience. I ask for your commitment for a fair and accurate census in 2000.

Sincerely,

LEE P. BROWN,  
*Mayor.*

BROWNSVILLE,  
TX, March 17, 1999.

Hon. SOLOMON ORTIZ,  
*U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ORTIZ: The 1990 census resulted in an undercount of eight million Americans. As a result the State of Texas was denied approximately \$1 billion in Federal funds. No other part of the country was more affected by this situation than perhaps California. In the case of Texas, the South Texas region which has a population that is largely Hispanic and a large concentration of families with incomes below poverty level, probably felt the brunt of the impact.

It is my understanding that in preparation for the 2000 census the House Government Oversight Committee, which you form part of, is presently considering legislation to require post-census local review instead of a statistical sampling method to arrive at an accurate census count. Our position is that the proposed legislation—H.R. 472, the Local Census Quality Check Act—while well intentioned, will prevent the Census Bureau from utilizing effective scientific methods for population counting, and may once more result in large undercounts. This unfortunately will impact once more the states with the larger populations and larger concentrations

of minority groups—e.g., Texas and California.

I therefore urge you to oppose passage of H.R. 472. I am certain that allowing the use of statistical samplings will result in the most accurate and timely census possible. This is after all, I am sure, what we are all interested in.

Thank you.  
Sincerely,

HENRY GONZALEZ,  
*Mayor of Brownsville.*

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments and for his work in his home State on getting an accurate count. What he is talking about is basic fairness. Because the census is so important, we must do absolutely everything that we can possibly do to ensure that everyone is included in the count. We know that previous censuses overlooked millions of Americans, especially children and minorities. That is not fair, it is not accurate, it is certainly not acceptable, and we are definitely determined to do better with this census. That is, if the Republican majority does not put language and requirements that make it impossible to get an accurate count.

The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) has been a leader on this issue and many issues before this Congress. I thank her very much for joining us in this special order and being with us tonight.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I want to thank the gentlewoman from New York as well for her leadership on this issue that has been constant and unselfish as well as her leadership as the cochair of the Women's Caucus, which makes her role even more important, because what we are talking about is an issue of counting people without political ramifications, unselfishly, and making sure that the people of America are taken care of.

I would imagine that those who might be listening to us tonight might be, not confused but wondering when are we going to come together around this issue. May I give to them a sense of success and appreciation to the Republicans who have withdrawn H.R. 472 this evening, because maybe they too are beginning to see the light and are beginning to count votes and realize that all Members of this House, Republicans and Democrats, would do better if every American is counted.

And so I rise today to support and encourage this House together to support statistical sampling and to let the Census Bureau do its job. My colleague from Texas has already indicated that my State lost \$1 billion. More importantly, my legislature is engaged in strong deliberations today to try and find a way to insure uninsured children. Because of the census of 1990, the State of Texas lost \$85 million in Medicaid funds, \$85 million in Medicaid funds. They also lost prevention and treatment dollars for substance abuse. They could have received as much as \$9 million. This is a shameful result.

And so it is extremely important that we move toward bringing this to a resolution. We must enact legislation that will guarantee an accurate census. The 1990 census undercounted approximately 4 million people. In the State of Texas, we lost a congressional district, not a congressional district that was going to selfishly support itself but one that would help bring dollars to the people of the State of Texas, as has occurred in other States throughout the Nation. The undercount in 1990 was 33 percent greater than the undercount in 1980.

Congress must enact legislation that will help to vindicate the undercount in the city of Houston, 3.9 percent, some 67 to 70,000 persons. This antiquated procedure only recorded 1,630,553 residents. Based on the scientific sampling method that was prepared for the 1990 census, it is estimated that over 66,000 Houstonians were missed by the 1990 census. Congress must be responsive. As well, we must find a way to break this impasse. Congress has to be able to guarantee an accurate census.

Let me share with my colleagues remarks from the director of the Census Bureau, newly appointed, approved by both the Republicans and Democrats of the Senate, Dr. Kenneth Prewitt, who said this about the proposal of Chairman Miller. He talked about the last three items suggested by Chairman Miller to make the census in Chairman Miller's perspective better.

He said: On three items, second mailing, the language initiative and local government review of mailing addresses, the Census Bureau believes it has already presented more efficient programs than the suggestions advanced by Chairman Miller. Indeed, if some of these initiatives were legislated in the manner now before the subcommittee, they would disrupt—may I say that again, Mr. Speaker—they would disrupt and even place at risk census 2000.

Dr. Prewitt goes on to say, "I will of course allocate more time" as he began his presentation to refuting those three, then the other points of the recommendations made by the chairman.

Does it not seem that if we can get agreement on seven aspects of recommendations made by the committee, but three specific points made, including the local government review, has been stated by Dr. Prewitt who has an independent responsibility to ensure America's accurate count, Dr. Kenneth Prewitt, head of the Census Bureau, approved by Republicans and Democrats in the United States Senate and given the consent of that Senate to do his job has said, very devastatingly, that the procedures that Chairman Miller wants us to go under would place at risk the census 2000.

It is extremely important, then, Mr. Speaker, that, one, we join with the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) and support her amendment. I am hoping that the discussion that we are having here tonight will bear

fruit and that there will be a possibility that we do not see H.R. 472. I hope, in fact, that we will find a way to continue the funding of the Census Bureau past June in the agreement we worked out over a year ago, and that we will also find common ground to ensure that those children in Texas who lost \$85 million in Medicaid dollars, those individuals who wanted to receive substance abuse treatment and lost \$9 million, those individuals who lost the opportunity to be represented in the United States Congress, the House of Representatives, one of the most powerful bodies in the world, would get their opportunity to be counted in the year 2000.

□ 2200

Mr. Speaker, I would hope this Congress would come down on the side of ensuring that the homeless are counted, the homeless veterans are counted, African Americans, Hispanics and Asians, people of multi language who are citizens and residents of the United States are counted, and for sure I hope that we will join with the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) and those of us who have been working with her, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) and so many others, and begin to formulate a resolution that the American people can understand and say to us for once, or maybe once in many times, or maybe as an example of what is to come, that the Congress has come down on the side of cities like the City of Houston, of cities like San Antonio and Dallas, of States like California and New York and all in between: Florida, Iowa, Michigan Mississippi, all coming in between, to indicate that we want an accurate census count for the United States of America.

With that, I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) for her leadership. She can count on me and, I know, so many others to continue to work to finally give to the American people the right kind of census count, a statistical sampling, so that we can begin the 21st century when everyone is both included, protected and provided for as they live under the flag of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here to continue advocating for an accurate census count that will guarantee an equitable distribution of federal funds. I would like to first thank Congresswoman CAROLYN MALONEY for her leadership as Co-Chair of the Congressional Census Caucus. She has become a national leader on this issue.

Congress must enact legislation that will guarantee an accurate census! The 1990 Census undercounted approximately 4 million people. Even more troubling, this last census was, for the first time in history, less accurate than its previous census. The undercount in 1990 was 33 percent greater than the undercount in the 1980 census.

Congress must enact legislation that will guarantee an accurate census! In fact, the City of Houston was undercounted by 3.9 percent in the 1990 Census as a result of utilizing

the current "head count" method. This antiquated procedure only recorded 1,630,553 residents. Based on the scientific sampling method that was prepared for the 1990 Census, it is estimated that over 66,000 Houstonians were missed by the 1990 Census.

Congress must enact legislation that will guarantee an accurate census! According to a recent GAO report Texas was in federal funding over the past decade because of the 1990 undercount.

Congress must enact legislation that will guarantee an accurate census! Houston was entitled to additional federal funds annually but these monies were allocated to another city in another state because the census 1990 was inaccurate.

Congress must enact legislation that will guarantee an accurate census! African-Americans, Hispanics, Asians, and American Indians were missed at a much greater rate than whites. Poor people living in cities and rural communities were disproportionately undercounted. An accurate census count provides an opportunity for every American to be counted regardless of race, geographic location and social economic class.

Congress must enact legislation that will guarantee an accurate census! H.R. 472 would put at risk the Census Bureau's ability to correct and adjust its counts using statistical data because it mandates that local review process begin after all other census activities are completed.

Congress must enact legislation that will guarantee an accurate census! H.R. 472 diminishes all efforts aimed at developing an accurate census count. The Maloney amendment to H.R. 472 strikes an equitable balance between local participation and an orderly timely accurate census count.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments. She is always right to the point, and I would like to put in the RECORD an editorial in the Sacramento Bee that really reinforces many of the points that she was making. It is from March 12 of 1999, and it is entitled: "More Census Mischief." And I would like to quote briefly from it, and the Sacramento Bee in its editorial says, and I quote:

At this eleventh hour Republicans in Congress are proposing legislation that seeks to significantly change census methodology and procedures, adding cost, confusion and, most critically, time to an already tight schedule. Three of the specific provisions in the Republican bills threaten the process.

The editorial ends with a very strong comment, and I quote:

With their predictably higher numbers of poor and minority residents, corrected counts are expected to benefit Democrats. If Republican Members of Congress can slow the census long enough to disrupt the count, corrected numbers will not reach the States in time to re-draw internal boundaries in 2001, thus helping Republicans. The public interest is in as accurate a census as possible. The Republican mischief at this late date threatens that.

End of quote, and again I will put the entire editorial from the Sacramento Bee into the RECORD:

There are 385 days left before April 1, 2000—Census Day. Preparation for the once-a-decade national head count began even before

the 1990 census was over. Twenty-five major software systems have been designed, linked and tested to keep track of the 175 million forms printed in six different languages, to pay hundreds of thousands of workers, to monitor tens of thousands of partnership programs and to produce 12 million maps needed to count an estimated 275 million residents at 175 million addresses. No small task.

As Kenneth Prewitt, director of the Census Bureau, told Congress the other day: "Every step, every operation, every procedure is on a huge scale and is interdependent with every other step, operation and procedure."

At this eleventh hour, Republicans in Congress are proposing legislation that seeks to significantly change census methodology and procedures, adding cost, confusion and, most critically, time to an already tight schedule. Three specific provisions in the Republican bills threaten the process.

One would require the Census Bureau to print forms in 33 languages instead of the six already planned for. Those six languages account for 99 percent of U.S. households. Using translators and community liaison workers, census planners already have tested and put in place procedures for reaching out not just to those who speak the 27 other languages Republicans want forms printed in, but to 130 other language groups as well. To add more foreign language forms at this late date would require new computing capacity, optical scanners, renegotiation of printing contracts and a dozen other changes, making an already difficult task more so.

Republicans also want a post-census local review, in which 39,198 units of local government would validate the bureau's housing count block-by-block. That was tried in 1990 and 1980 and, according to a Republican former Census Bureau director, turned out to be a logistical and public relations nightmare.

The last bad idea offered would require a second mailing of the census questionnaire. Second mailings were tested during dress rehearsals last year and resulted in 40 percent duplicate responses, another wasteful and time-consuming effort.

The real Republican goal here seems obvious: delay. That would make it harder for the Census Bureau to perform the controversial post-census statistical surveys so crucial to correcting for the expected undercount of poor and minority residents. The U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that federal law bars the use of corrected numbers to determine how many congressional seats a state can have. But those numbers may still be used to redraw congressional and legislative boundaries within individual states.

With their predictably higher numbers of poor and minority residents, corrected counts are expected to benefit Democrats. If Republican members of Congress can slow the census long enough to disrupt the count, corrected numbers won't reach the states in time to redraw internal boundaries in 2001, thus helping Republicans. The public interest is in as accurate a census as possible. The Republican mischief at this late date threatens that.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that a new Member of Congress has joined us, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), and she serves on the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. She also serves with me on the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, where she has already demonstrated leadership on protecting consumer rights, and I thank her for coming here and joining us on the floor tonight.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY). One of the reasons I really wanted to come here tonight was to be able to express publicly my admiration to the gentlewoman from New York and my gratitude for the work that the gentlewoman has done on this issue. It has really been an inspiration to me and a role model for me as a new Member.

There was a time in the history of our Nation when certain individuals were not counted as whole people. Congress long ago rejected this kind of blatant discrimination, and every Member today would, I know, assert his or her abhorrence of this practice.

But I fear, along with many of my colleagues, that in a far more subtle but also fundamentally destructive proposal we are again jeopardizing the full and fair counting of every American.

What is especially disturbing about H.R. 472, which I was pleased to hear was removed from tomorrow's calendar, but what is especially disturbing about the legislation is that it is carefully worded to take on the appearance of making the census more fair when its actual intent and consequences are just the opposite. While H.R. 472 purports to double-check accuracy, its real effect is to prevent the use of statistical methods in the final census count.

I come from a county, Cook County in Illinois, in a district that has historically been undercounted for one well-known and well-documented reason. We have large populations of poor, minority and immigrant residents. These are the people who will disproportionately suffer from being undercounted.

John Stroger, Jr., the great president of the Cook County Board of Commissioners wrote, quote:

"Cook County is strongly opposed to H.R. 472. A recent study found that," and he quotes from the study, "34 cities and counties lost more than \$500 million in Federal and State funds during this past decade due to the undercount in the 1990 census. These dollars translate into meals for seniors, transportation and job training."

This bill is one of a series that was considered in the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, on which I sit along with the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), which sound good but which I believe have the effect of cynically stymieing the use of modern scientific methods for obtaining an accurate count by delaying the entire process.

None of the proposals, including H.R. 472, were given proper hearings. Had that happened, we could have heard Dr. Prewitt, Census Bureau Director, tell us that H.R. 472, quote from him, would interfere with and put at risk, unquote, the Census Bureau's plan which already includes review of addresses by local officials. We could have heard the National Academy of Sciences explain that the key to an accurate census is

the use of modern statistical methods, that without this the undercount of urban and rural poor and minorities will persist.

In fact, all of the real experts, the American Statistical Association, the National Association of Business Economists, the Association of Public Data Users, and on and on, the real experts whose one and only interest is accuracy endorse statistical methods as the most accurate.

I have to say that in light of the positive spirit my husband and I experienced last weekend in Hershey at our bipartisan retreat, this bill is a real disappointment, and I am hoping that the fact that it was taken off the calendar for tomorrow is an indication that perhaps there has been a change of heart. It represents to me the reasons that citizens grow alienated from the political process. I see it as a clever manipulation of the system, as cynical census mischief that just happens to hurt many vulnerable people. It makes me sad, and I would hope that if this bill does reach the floor, that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me in voting "no".

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments, and I would like to put in the record an editorial from the Chicago Tribune dated March 14 entitled: "Not One Census, But Two," and I quote from this, this particular editorial. It ends by saying:

"It has not escaped the notice of either party that the people who are missed in the old fashioned census tend to be the kind of people, poor, minority, urban, who generally vote Democratic. But pretending they don't exist is not likely to work to the long-run advantage of the GOP. Now that they have won on the apportionment, fairness and political wisdom argue that Republicans should compromise on the other census battle."

Is that the gentlewoman from Illinois' hometown paper?

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to add this to the list of items that have been put in the RECORD:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Mar. 14, 1999]

#### NOT ONE CENSUS BUT TWO

The decennial census of the population is one of the most important tasks undertaken by the federal government—and one of the hardest. A complete count is impossible, because there are so many people in the United States, some of them hard to find. Experts say the last census missed about 4 million people, including 2.4 percent of those in Chicago.

The Clinton administration wanted to address this problem by using statistical methods known as "sampling" to arrive at estimates of people who are omitted by the traditional head count.

But in January, the Supreme Court ruled that federal law does not permit sampling for purposes of congressional apportionment. It's not clear that, if obliged to decide, the justices would conclude that the Constitution does either.

The most noteworthy consequence of the verdict is that when it comes time to divvy up seats in Congress, some states may be

shortchanged. That can't be helped. What can be avoided is using a plainly faulty tabulation for other purposes.

The court held that sampling was forbidden for apportionment. For all other purposes, though, it not only is permissible but may be required. So the administration plans for the Census Bureau to come up with two numbers in 2000—one based on traditional door-to-door methods for parceling out House seats and another using state-of-the-art techniques for such purposes as distribution of federal money and state legislative redistricting.

That proposal is imperfect, but not as imperfect as the alternative, which is to use the less accurate tally for everything.

Republicans object to spending any extra funds to supplement the conventional census, and warn the public will be confused. But it's hard to see the sense in refusing to allocate government aid in accordance with where the intended beneficiaries actually are.

The Constitution may bar the use of estimates when the sacred matter of voting is involved, but that principle doesn't apply when it comes to social welfare programs.

It has not escaped the notice of either party that the people who are missed in the old-fashioned census tend to be the kind of people (poor, minority, urban) who generally vote Democratic. But pretending they don't exist is not likely to work to the long-run advantage of the GOP. Now that they've won on apportionment, fairness and political wisdom argue that Republicans should compromise on the other census battle.

It is very important that the 2000 census be complete, and the Census Bureau will use modern scientific methods, techniques that will provide an essential quality check on Census 2000 to ensure a complete and accurate census.

The President of the United States has spoken out in support of accuracy, and he has said, and I quote a statement he made on June 2 of 1998, and I quote:

"Improving the census should not be a partisan issue. It is not about politics. It is about people. It is about making sure that every American really, literally counts."

Mr. Speaker, he has indicated on several occasions publicly and in meetings, and really he told me himself once in a private conversation, that he would veto any vehicle that in any way undermined an accurate count.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, some of the articles that have appeared in Roll Call tend to speak of partisan politics and goals, and I would like to put in the RECORD the editorial from March 15 entitled: "Census Summit:"

#### CENSUS SUMMIT

Republicans and Democrats are at the brink of a catastrophic war over the 2000 Census. It's time for a summit conference between President Clinton and House Speaker Dennis Hastert (R-IL) to avert a partial shutdown of the federal government and, even worse, a failed census that convinces the U.S. population that its government in Washington can't even count.

The issue over which the parties are fighting, of course, is sampling—the use of modern polling techniques to estimate the hardest-to-reach 10th of the population. The Clinton administration adamantly supports sampling, backed by ex-President George Bush's census director and the National Science

Foundation, which called for it as a remedy for serious undercounting in the 1990 Census.

Republicans adamantly oppose sampling, contending that the constitutional mandate of an "actual enumeration" forbids sampling and fearing that the administration would rig the count to cost the GOP House seats in the post-2000 redistricting.

The Supreme Court might have resolved the conflict, but didn't. It failed to rule on the constitutionality issue and rendered a split decision on the 1976 census law—banning sampling for purposes of apportioning House seats among the states, but permitting it for drawing districts within the states and for dispensing federal grants. The Clinton administration wants to proceed with a dual-track census, but Republicans are determined to block it.

It's possible that the entire State, Commerce and Justice departments could shutdown on June 15 if no agreement on sampling is reached. That's because last year, instead of resolving their differences, Congress and the administration postponed their day of reckoning by funding the three departments for only part of this fiscal year.

As Roll Call reported last week, Hastert is preparing for war by assembling a strategy team to devise ways of convincing the country that this shutdown—if it occurs—is Clinton's fault, not that of the GOP. Meantime, on another front, the House Government Reform Committee is set to mark up legislation containing at least three provisions that are likely to delay and complicate census-taking in the guise of improving the count.

One provision would require printing all census forms in 34 languages instead of the planned six, an enormous logistical problem for the Census Bureau, which has made other plans for contacting persons speaking minority languages.

Mr. Speaker, the census is not only about counting people and the distribution of Federal funds, it is about accurate data, and we need to have accurate data in order to come forward with good policy. It is the basis, literally the census is the basis of all demographic information used by educators, policymakers, journalists and community leaders. America relies on census data absolutely every single day to determine where to build more roads, hospitals and child care centers. So it is important that this data be accurate so that we have long-range, accurate policies, that we really draw upon on the information that is provided by the census.

We know that we have a problem. In 1990 the census missed more than 8 million people and double-counted more than 4 million people. Poor people living in cities and rural communities, African Americans and Latinos, immigrants and children were disproportionately undercounted, and in order to correct these mistakes and in order to correct the undercount, we really should leave the 2000 census in the hand of the professionals at the Census Bureau, allow the seasoned experts to plan and conduct the most accurate census. The professionals at the Census Bureau are continuing their preparations to produce the most accurate census permitted under the law. Our goal must be to support these professionals using the most up-to-date, scientific methods and the best technology available.

I must say that all of the scientific community supports the Census Bureau's plan. Many leading Republicans support it. My own Mayor Giuliani, who is a Republican, joined many of us who were opposed to the lawsuit that was being brought by Speaker Gingrich to really stop the use of modern scientific methods. Dr. Barbara Bryant, who is a Republican who served in the Bush administration, has testified many times before the committee in support of modern scientific counts.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I represent Mississippi's Second Congressional District. Based on per capita income, the Second District is the 430th poorest Congressional District in the nation. Let me say that again. Out of the 435 Congressional Districts, the District I represent ranks 430 based on per capita income.

I know this Mr. Speaker because the Census Bureau extrapolated these statistics based on the data they compiled during the 1990 Census. Economic, social, health, employment, housing, and other types of information crucial to knowing who populates not only our nation but our Congressional Districts can be derived from the enumeration of Americans taken every ten years.

The census is important . . . extremely important. As Members of Congress, I think we can all probably agree on that statement. However, upon closer examination, the delicate balance we have managed to maintain beings to crumble. While Democrats admittedly want to count the urban and rural poor, minorities, legal immigrants and children, Republicans have publicly stated that an accurate accounting of all Americans will jeopardize their ability to hold on to a majority in Congress.

I argue that the Republicans have their priorities mixed up. Counting Americans is what we are supposed to be doing here, not protecting our political majority in Congress. What they apparently fail to realize is the impact an inaccurate Census count has had on the population of poor, rural and urban Congressional Districts, including the one I represent. In 1990, nearly 14,700 of my constituents were not counted, ironically placing my District near the top of the list at number 75 out of many Congressional Districts that experienced undercounts. Most of the people who were not counted in my District were poor people, African Americans, Latinos, immigrants and children living in the city of Jackson, Bolivar County, Madison County, Warren County, and Washington County.

I am going to take a unique approach to this issue. I am going to admit the reason unabashedly I want all of the people in Mississippi's Second Congressional District counted is to increase the amount of federal funding received by the State of Mississippi.

Mr. Speaker, allow me to give you some additional statistics. Of the fifty states, Mississippi ranks first in the percent of births to unwed mothers, first in food stamp recipients, first in infant mortality rates, last in state health rankings, fifth in percent of non-elderly population without health insurance, 41st in average 8th grade math proficiency scores, 36th in average 8th grade reading proficiency scores, and 50th in per capita personal income.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind you that I represent the poorest Congressional District in the second poorest state

in the nation. In some places in my District federal funds are the life's blood of economic hope. Usually, the county tax base cannot cover the many needs of the area's residents. The federal government has stepped in on numerous occasions and filled the financial gaps that would have otherwise increased our state's infant mortality rate, prevented the basic educational needs of our children from being met, and prevented Mississippians from building the vital infrastructure needed to support businesses and to provide jobs.

When any segment of our population goes uncounted, it jeopardizes our chances to receive invaluable federal funding. Some of the programs that rely on population-related data to allocate funds include: 1890 Land Grant Colleges, Water and Waste Water Disposal Systems for Rural Communities, Community Development Block Grants, Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Summers Jobs, Education Block Grants, Head Start, and many others that have specifically benefited the District I represent.

The use of current statistical methods is the only way to insure Mississippi receives the most accurate count possible. It is the only way to guarantee that our respective constituents receive their fair share of federal dollars.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to make the case for an accurate year 2000 census. We must do what we can to avoid a repetition of the 1990 census, which was the least accurate U.S. census this century. In 1990, over 800,000 Californians were not counted. Subsequent studies by the Census Bureau found that 17,153 individuals in my own district went uncounted. The 1990 census is also known for having done a poor job of counting minorities. This deficiency was also reflected in my district, where 63 percent of those not counted were Hispanic.

What good is a census if it doesn't count everyone?

We need an accurate census so that federal funds and congressional seats can be fairly distributed among and within the states. When I was Mayor of the City of Norwalk, it was blatantly clear how vitally important census figures were in determining my city's access to much-needed federal dollars. Communities in my direct, my state and around the nation, depend on an accurate census to provide them with the dollars they deserve to support important education, health and infrastructure programs.

Therefore I supported, and continue to support, the use of modern statistical methods to produce the most accurate census possible. Unfortunately, the Supreme Court took the position that these modern methods cannot be used for the reapportionment of congressional seats among the states—a decision that will likely leave California without all the representation it deserves.

But the Supreme Court decision did affirm that these methods can be used in determining how to draw district lines and distribute federal funds. I hope that we will be able to use modern statistical methods for those purposes.

I know that many of my colleagues on the other side oppose the use of modern methods for any purpose, and I am saddened that they lack a commitment to producing the most accurate census possible.

If we are not going to be able to use the best methods recommended by our Census

Bureau, then let us move quickly to ensure that the people who conduct the head count, using old and out-dated methods will, at the very least, have some of the tools needed to conduct a successful count.

This is going to be the largest peacetime mobilization in U.S. history—500,000 people will be hired all across the country for temporary positions to count our population wherever they may be found. To ensure that their effort is a success, these census workers must be familiar with the areas in which they will be working. This will help minimize the expected undercount.

Therefore, I am strongly urging the President to sign a waiver, authorized by the 1978 Civil Service Reform Act, to allow the use of a supplemental, bipartisan political referral system to fill the approximately 500,000 temporary decennial census positions across the nation. This will allow for local input into who is chosen to run the census. It will ensure that familiarity with the local area and the great diversity of our communities are critical factors taken into consideration when hiring qualified people to conduct our census.

Both Presidents Carter and Bush signed such waivers for the 1980 and 1990 Censuses. This approach was determined to be a very effective method in attracting qualified applicants accustomed to dealing with the public.

With a waiver, Members of Congress, as well as a host of state and local officials will be able to recommend individuals in their communities that are thoroughly familiar with the territory they will survey, including hard to reach populations. And, of critical importance, they will possess the sensitivity to deal effectively with local populations, inclusive of ethnic and racial minorities, who may be suspicious of unknown government workers coming into their communities.

The 2000 Census is fast upon us and unfortunately the Supreme Court has already tied one hand behind our backs, making an accurate count all but impossible. We in Congress must not further hamper the Census Bureau in conducting the best and fairest possible count. I strongly urge the President to sign the waiver as soon as possible and for Congress to allow the Census Bureau to use the most modern statistical methods for determining how to disperse federal funding and draw district boundaries within states.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to close by saying that we should let the professionals do their job. We should let them conduct an accurate count using accurate scientific methods. We know what the last count gave us. It gave us an undercount that disproportionately hurt minorities and the poor and the children, and we should not let that happen again. We must correct it, and we have a plan that does that. We should be supporting the professionals, not trying to undermine their efforts in getting the most accurate count possible.

□ 2215

#### ISSUES THAT DEFINE THE REPUBLICAN MAJORITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 6, 1999, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I want to spend this evening's Republican special order hour talking about a number of issues that define our Republican majority and what we are trying to accomplish here in the United States Congress. I want to invite any of our conference members who may be monitoring today's proceedings and this special order to come down on the floor and join in this discussion if they have anything to add to it or to relate to the rest of the Members of this great body.

One of the topics that I wanted to discuss tonight is an effort by the administration to greatly expand the percentage of land in America that is owned and possessed by the government as opposed to private landowners.

I recently had a chance to go to Russia with an 8-member delegation, the purpose of which was to discuss national missile defense and the legislation that we just passed last week relative to establishing a missile defense policy. The absence of property rights there captured my attention.

In Russia, all land is owned by the government. Even since the fall of Communism, Russian politicians have failed to make the transition to private land ownership, despite growing public fondness for this dramatic step. As more Russians exchange ideas with the rest of the world, they are collectively coming to an obvious conclusion that government is a poor steward of the land. The sad irony is the propensity of our own Federal Government to ignore so self-evident a truth.

The White House has proposed a virtual real estate spending spree involving the government snatching up private land faster than one can say glasnost or perestroika. Well, perhaps it is time for a little honesty, openness and restructuring here at home, too.

Westerners bristled during the State of the Union performance when the President announced his land legacy initiative, a ten and a quarter billion dollar land grab. Remember, the Federal Government already owns 30 percent of all land in the United States and a staggering 50 percent of all land in the west.

Now add to the Federal estate, expanding land acquisitions by State and local government, and it is not hard to conclude that America's destination is the very point of Russia's departure. The Clinton administration seems bent on breaking this bond between the American people and the earth, the very stricture of President Teddy Roosevelt's 1902 Reclamation Act which opened the door for water development, irrigation and agriculture in the west.

The Federal Government is notoriously ill-suited to manage the land it now holds, let alone more. For example, last year, the General Accounting Office reported to Congress widespread financial mismanagement, fraud, abuse