clearly stated mandate for safeguarding the security of a future status arrangement. Direct negotiations between the parties would improve the chances of achieving an agreement that leaves the people of Karabagh with a sense that their security needs will be addressed.

Mr. Speaker, as the cochairman of the Congressional Caucus on Armenian Issues, I have been pleased to work with colleagues from both sides of the aisle to help the people of Armenia and Karabagh. Late last year, just before adjournment, members of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations succeeded in approving for the first time direct U.S. humanitarian aid to Karabagh. I am concerned, however, that not all of the relatively modest amount of $12.5 million will even get to the people in Karabagh who need assistance and I will continue to monitor closely the provisions of said aid to Karabagh as I am sure will many of my colleagues, including the Speaker, who is here this evening.

As of yesterday, we are beginning the fiscal year 1999 budget process, and I am sure that the pro-Armenia forces of this Congress will again work together to show our support for the people of Armenia and Karabagh, and we will continue to urge our State Department to pursue policies in the Caucasus region that will promote peace and stability, while recognizing the precious value of self-determination for the people of Karabagh.

I just want to say once again, Mr. Speaker, that this evening we heard about the President's resignation. It is a momentous occasion, but it was done with an incredible amount of dignity and respect for the democratic process, and I think it bodes very well for the future of Armenia, as well as relations between Armenia and our country.

CENSUS 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 60.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, tonight I want to introduce myself to the American people and to all the stakeholders in the 2000 decennial census. My name is DAN MILLER and I represent the 13th Congressional District in Florida. I am the new chairman of the Subcommittee on the Census. The task of our subcommittee is to work with and to oversee the Census Bureau to ensure that we have a successful 2000 census.

For many Americans listening tonight, the 2000 census may not seem like the most interesting subject. I know it is tough to get excited about how to count people. We do, after all, count sheep in our head to try to fall asleep. But the census is important, and it has real impact on us and our government.

Why do we take a census every 10 years? For two reasons. Let me repeat that, for two reasons. First, we take the census to apportion the Representatives, and the House Representatives among the 50 States. As the population grows and shifts between States, the numbers of Members each State elects to represent it in this House may increase or decrease.

The second reason is to redraw the district boundaries of congressional and legislative districts to equalize those districts' populations. That is done so each Member represents the same number of people.

This must be done for congressional, State legislative, county and even city council districts. This is necessary to preserve the historic gains of our civil rights laws and guarantee one person, one vote. The census is the underpinning of our entire Federal, State and local government systems.

There is a lot of other important data that we receive from the census, like how many people in homes, our ethnic heritages, how many of us are married, how many people have dependent children, et cetera. But these issues are secondary. We must do a fair, honest and accurate census every 10 years so every American can be represented and have a voice in their government.

The House of Representatives, as the voice of the American people, therefore is the preeminent Federal stakeholder in the census. The Senate does not need a census to exist. The executive branch does not need a census to exist, the judicial branch does not need a census to exist, but the House of Representatives literally needs a census conducted every 10 years to exist as a constitutional body. The legitimacy of the House of Representatives and the American system of democracy rests on a successful census.

So let me say what should be obvious. The House of Representatives must have a huge say in the planning, preparation, and implementation of the 2000 census. It would seem crazy if the executive branch would ever consider moving forward with a plan which the majority of the House of Representatives does not support. The President has preeminence in conducting foreign policy, but the Constitution clearly gives this Congress the lead in conducting the census. But crazy as it sounds, the Census Bureau has unilaterally decided to try a radical new approach to conducting the census. They know Congress disapproves, but they still plan to carry out this untested, risky method that in all likelihood will not even work. The Clinton administration has known for at least three years now, since they released the outlines of their unprecedented plan, that many Members of the House have serious reservations. Chairman Clinger made it quite clear in 1996 in a report from the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. The report stated, ''The committee is seriously concerned'' about the Bureau's plan. Chairman Clinger added that the committee was concerned that the Bureau's new method ''may undermine public confidence in the decennial census and reduce public participation.'' Chairman Clinger concluded with this serious concern: ''It appears that the fundamental constitutional purpose for the decennial census, which is to apportion the House of Representatives, has been deemphasized.'' In other words, the Census Bureau seems to have forgotten what the census is all about.

The Census Bureau's own Inspector General took the Census Bureau to task last fall for poor relations with Congress. The Inspector General stated in clear terms, ''The Bureau needs to increase its credibility with Congress.''

Just last November, a clear congressional majority passed the funding bill for the Commerce Department, and in that legislation the House and Senate made clear its position. We believe that the Census Bureau's plan, let me quote from the legislation, ''poses the risk of inaccurate, invalid and unconstitutional census.''

I would think that statement alone, which was included in the legislation signed by the President, would send a strong signal to the Census Bureau that their new plan does not have enough political support for it to move forward. Yet, they do not seem to get the message.

Some say Congress has delegated its authority to the employees at the Census Bureau to conduct the census any way they choose. On the other hand, a great number of respected legal minds believe the Clinton plan is unconstitutional. That is an open question of both constitutional and statutory law. The House of Representatives will soon be filing suit as agreed to by the majority in Congress last year, to prevent the unlawful use of the polling techniques at the heart of the Bureau's unprecedented plan. Hopefully, the court will resolve these issues. But no matter what they decide, the administration is wrong to try and ram down some new plan without political consensus.

I am not a lawyer, so I will not try to make a complex legal argument tonight. I am, however, a Member of the House of Representatives, so I will make a civic argument. It is beyond comprehension that the Clinton administration would move forward if it is so clear that the House of Representatives disapproves. We are going to file suit to stop their plan. That should give the administration a pretty strong signal that we do not like what they are doing. It is simply bad government for the Census Bureau to unilaterally push ahead on something that the House does not approve and the American people know very little about.

Again, the legitimacy of the House is at stake, and with it, the confidence of the American people and their system of representative democracy. Our opinion, whether the Census Bureau agrees with it or not, must carry great weight. I think it is worth pointing out that the House, like most people, do

not have a radical, impractical idea of how we should conduct the census. Common sense says we simply need to count everybody. The majority of Members simply want the Bureau to use the basic method we have always used in this country. We want to make some common sense improvements and spend enough money to make sure we count all Americans, but we are not trying to push an unprecedented, untested method on the Bureau, nor are we advocating an approach that will not work.

In fact, it is the administration that has the unprecedented and highly complex idea of how to conduct the census. They have unilaterally decided to abandon the method we have used in this country for 200 years because they have a new academic theory. If the Clinton administration believes they have a better method, they should present the plan to Congress and get our approval, but the simple fact that they want to try an untested, unprecedented method, the burden of proof is on them. The burden of receiving explicit congressional approval is on them. The burden of convincing the American people to pay for this extravagant experiment is on them.

The House has wisely formed a subcommittee to conduct oversight on the census, and I am honored to serve as its chairman and we will have a very successful committee. I believe the Census Bureau wants to work with us, but at the moment they do not have a leader. Martha Riche, the Director for the past several years, left office last week. This is a difficult time to lose a census director. The Commerce Inspector General and the General Accounting Office have made clear that the census is not in great shape at this moment. In a few months, they will be conducting some important dress rehearsals in Sacramento, California, and Charleston, South Carolina and in South Dakota. Simultaneously, they must continue ramping up for the 2000 census. The Bureau is in dire need of leadership and organization, and they need a director as soon as possible.

I want to make my position clear about the qualifications needed for the next census director. First, Mr. President, do not play political games with the legitimacy of the House of Representatives. Do not send up a political spokesperson who is not committed to faithfully carrying out the intent of the law. I have said I have no litmus test, but, Mr. President, you better not have a litmus test either. Your nominee must be prepared to plan and carry out a full enumeration, because that is the will of the majority of this Congress.

Article I of our Constitution requires Congress to conduct the decennial census to apportion Representatives among the States. We take it very seriously. I believe, therefore, that it would be wise to consult the House extensively before we nominate a new census director. We cannot risk the people's confidence in the 2000 census. The next census director must not be a political lightning rod for untried ideology. In no measure a successful census is defined by the people's confidence and its fairness and accuracy. The majority of the Representatives and Senators oppose the administration's new untested methodology of how to conduct the 2000 census. It would be a tragic mistake to put forward a nominee who the congressional majority views as unwilling to work with us.

□ 1845

Over the next several months, our subcommittee plans to hold a series of hearings to learn more about the status of the planning for the census. We intend to examine the design flaws in the Bureau's complicated plans. We will make sure that the Bureau moves forward with planning for a new numeration as the recent legislation signed by the President requires.

I hope to offer constructive and practical ideas of how we can improve on past censuses without risking a failed census. I do not believe in throwing out the baby with the bath water. We have a great deal of work to do to save the census. Let us get started.

AGREEMENT BETWEEN GOVERNMENTS OF UNITED STATES AND LATVIA CONCERNING FISHERIES OFF THE COAST OF THE UNITED STATES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.), I transmit herewith an Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Latvia extending the Agreement of April 8, 1993, Concerning Fisheries Off the Coasts of the United States, with annex, as extended (the 1993 Agreement). The present Agreement, which was effected by an exchange of notes at Riga on February 13 and May 23, 1997, extends the 1993 Agreement to December 31, 1999.

In light of the importance of our fisheries relationship with the Republic of Latvia, I urge that the Congress give favorable consideration to this Agreement at an early date.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 3, 1998.*

ANNUAL REPORT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD, FISCAL YEAR 1996—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Ways and Means:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the Annual Report of the Railroad Retirement Board for Fiscal Year 1996, pursuant to the provisions of section 7(b)(6) of the Railroad Retirement Act and section 12(l) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 3, 1998.*

DISAPPOINTMENT WITH THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET SUBMISSION

(Mr. MILLER of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today the Committee on the Budget began the process of reviewing the 1999 budget submission of the President. It was very disappointing for a Member who is a very fiscally conservative Member to see a proposal that has more smoke and mirrors of how to spend more money.

We had a budget agreement that we agreed to last year, and I had the pleasure of being at the South Lawn of the White House when the President signed that document in August. Less than 6 months later, we have $150 billion more in spending. I know they have a lot of neat little gimmicks of how to disguise the spending, but the bottom line is it is not in the spirit of the budget agreement that was signed last year and in the reconciliation bill that was signed into law by the President. That was not the intent of the agreement that we worked on last year.

For those of us who went along with that agreement, knowing that we would have to have tight spending controls this coming year, we feel very, very disappointed; and I feel it is not right to try to get us to move ahead with more spending programs at this time.

One of the ways to justify it is this tobacco settlement. I am not a pro-tobacco Congressman. I would be classified as an anti-tobacco Congressman. But the point is, we should not begin spending money until we have it in our hands.

We do not know what kind of agreement will be reached. The administration claims they are going to send one up in a few weeks, but we do not have a plan before us right now. So how are we going to have this money and why are we spending it before we have it in