

What happened in 1990 was the failure was on the sample. Sampling was the failure in 1990. That is the concern that we have today because now the Clinton administration only wants to rely on sampling. It was a failure in 1990, and they are going to totally rely on it in year 2000.

What happened in 1990 when they used sampling, Secretary Mosbacher had the choice of, at that time, whether to use sampling and adjust the census. What the recommendation of the Census Bureau was back in 1981 was to adjust the census, take away a congressional seat from Wisconsin, take away a congressional seat from Pennsylvania, give them away based on adjustment, based on statistics.

I mean, how do you explain that to the States that they are saying we counted these people, but the statisticians in Washington think they are not right. Thank goodness Secretary Mosbacher rejected that recommendation, because we found out in 1992 there was a major computer glitch. It was a computer error, and it would have been done by error and by mistake.

What would people in Wisconsin and Pennsylvania say knowing they would have lost a congressional seat because of mistakes by the Census Bureau? So sampling was a failure because what they did with the sampling is they delete people from the census.

There are census tracts and areas all over the country where the Census Bureau would come in because of the computer analysis and said, on average, we do not think all those people are there, so we are going to delete people, not because they double-counted, not because of mistakes, just because of averages and statistics, and we could allow that.

Another thing we found out in analyzing the 1990 census, and the Census Bureau says this, that the numbers are not accurate below 100,000. So the accuracy becomes less accurate when we get to districts of under 100,000.

□ 1245

When we work with the census, we deal with census tracks and census blocks, and those are the building stones, the cornerstones to building a Congressional District, a State Senate district, a State House district, a county commission district, a city council. And the accuracy is less by adjustment than having the full enumeration. So the Census Bureau admits that that is a problem. And now the Clinton administration wants to rely on this potentially inaccurate information.

In fact, the Census Bureau, when they reviewed the 1990 census, decided not to adjust even for the intercensal census, which is when they adjust between 1990 and 2000, because it was not accurate enough to use, and they did not even use that 150,000 use of sampling.

So what does the Clinton administration propose in the year 2000? They have proposed first, instead of using a

full enumeration and counting everybody like they did in 1990, they say oh, no, we are only going to count 90 percent of the people; ninety percent of the people in 60,000 separate samples, because there will be one for each census track.

So we start off without the full data, and then they will do a sample of 750,000 households, five times larger than they used in the sampling experiment back in 1990. But they will do it in half the time, with a less experienced work force.

So they are going to sample five times as many people in half the time, with a less experienced work force, and use that to adjust the sample today data they started with at 90 percent.

So we are moving towards a very complex system that will lead to failure, and it threatens our entire Democratic elections process in this country.

PUERTO RICO IS FISCALLY CONSERVATIVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Madam Speaker, when the United States was founded, many States severed the previously existing relationship between property ownership and voting rights by granting universal suffrage to white men. Since then, of course, the right to vote has become truly universal, extended to all men and women without regard to race, ethnic origin, or economic considerations.

The point I wish to make today, however, is that early on in the Nation's history, it was established that the right to vote, that is, the right to participate in this democracy, exists independent of an individual's economic well-being. Unfortunately, it is a concept that the opponents of self-determination for the 3,800,000 American citizens in Puerto Rico just do not seem to get. They would deny the U.S. citizens in Puerto Rico the opportunity to vote on status just because they allege that poverty on the island would affect the Nation's pocketbook.

Opponents of Puerto Rican self-determination incorrectly state that a vote for self-determination is a vote for Puerto Rican statehood. And contrary to reality, they also allege the Island's poor will cost the U.S. Treasury many millions of dollars more a year if Puerto Rico becomes a State. Quite the contrary is true.

Puerto Rico is now a welfare Commonwealth. We receive Federal grants but do not pay Federal income taxes. If Puerto Rico were a State today, our tax contribution to the U.S. Treasury would net a positive cash flow of \$1.5 billion over and above the additional Federal expenditures in grants and direct payments, which Puerto Rico

would receive as a State in addition to what it is now receiving.

In their rush to paint the worst case scenario, opponents of Puerto Rican self-determination overlook the stable investment environment which statehood would bring about, overlook the growth potential of Puerto Rico's many assets and the fiscally conservative underpinnings of the Puerto Rican economy.

It is a fact that the present territorial relationship between Puerto Rico and the rest of the Nation has its economic downside. Tax credit to U.S. corporations designed to stimulate economic development on the Island have actually drained the territory of investment capital. A study by Hex, Incorporated, an international economic policy and development consulting firm based in Cambridge, Massachusetts, reveals that despite an investment of \$12.3 billion in Puerto Rico between 1981 and 1994, the Island suffered a net loss of \$2.2 billion in investment capital. The repatriation of profits by the U.S. companies which benefit from tax credits accounts for the most of the loss.

Alexander Odishelidze, president of Employee Benefits Associates, Incorporated, which is a consulting firm, is correct when he says, "You cannot build a solid economy when the capital created by the productivity of the workers is shipped out as soon as it is created." Statehood would confer the sense of stability that encourages economic investment. Hex, Inc. projects that statehood would accelerate fiscal and economic growth in Puerto Rico by an annual 2.2 to 3.5 percent.

Chilean economist Fernando Lefort, in a working paper for the International Tax Program at Harvard Law School, calculated if Puerto Rico had become a State in 1955, the average Puerto Rican would have been earning \$6,000 a year more by 1994.

The fact is that Puerto Rico has the assets for growth. It boasts a manufacturing base which employs 15.6 percent of the Island's work force; highly educated skilled workers, many of whom are bilingual and experienced users of high-tech equipment in the pharmaceutical, plastics and electronics industry, as well as the scenic beauty and historic landmarks that so much appeal to tourists.

What is more, the value-added per dollar of production wages paid in Puerto Rico is double the national average. These assets alone led one analyst interviewed by the Wall Street Journal to conclude that as a State, Puerto Rico's underlying growth potential would be the strongest in the country, the Nevada of 10 years from now.

In addition, Puerto Rico practices sound fiscal policy. Since adoption of its Constitution in 1952, Puerto Rico has required the government to approve the balanced budget annually. Four years ago tax reform provided \$400 million in tax relief to Island residents while generating a government

surplus. Puerto Rico has also initiated a privatization strategy, which is expected to save the government \$1 billion over a period of 10 years.

It is grossly unjust and undemocratic to bind the people of Puerto Rico to a colonial economy and then deny them the right to self-determination, giving as a reason the fact that the Island territory has not thrived fiscally as well as the equal partners, the 50 States. Let us not revive the practice of democracy for the rich and by the rich, but rather let us extend the right of self-determination to the American citizens of Puerto Rico, no matter the size of their bank accounts.

We discarded the poll tax as unfair and undemocratic. It should not be revived to deprive 4 million U.S. citizens of the right to self-determination.

THE WEED AND SEED PROGRAM WORKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, Members often take to the floor to talk about our government, how it is working or not working. In fact, I have done that myself occasionally.

Today, my colleagues, I will talk about a government program that does work. My colleagues will hear about how a little funding in the hands of a caring and committed group of individuals can make a huge difference in the lives of hundreds of young people. I want to share with my colleagues today a story about the Weed and Seed Program that has helped transform the Howard Middle School in my hometown of Ocala, Florida.

In 1993, I contacted the Attorney General, Janet Reno, in support of bringing the Weed and Seed Program to Florida. Since then, communities near and about my district, including Gainesville, Jacksonville, and Ocala have received funding through this program.

The Weed and Seed Program coordinates the use of law enforcement and criminal prosecution to weed out criminal offenders in the targeted neighborhoods and "seeds" the community with housing employment and various social programs. I have long supported the goals of the Weed and Seed Program because, Madam Speaker, it is community based and not an entangling government bureaucracy.

The Howard Middle School in my home town of Ocala, Florida, has nurtured this seed into a wonderful product. The school has developed creative after-school activities that keep the students positively engaged. This is important because, as we all know, Madam Speaker, nearly 5 million school-aged children spend time without adult supervision during a typical week. Research indicates that during these unsupervised hours, children are

more likely to engage in at-risk behavior, such as crime and drug use. In fact, the FBI reports that most juvenile crime takes place between the hours of 3 p.m. and 8 p.m.

Unfortunately, 70 percent of all public schools do not offer after-school programs. Howard Middle School is one of the valuable exceptions. Last week I visited this school to witness firsthand the community services it has developed. I was greeted by the principal, Scott Hackmyer; Joan Spainhower, public relations officer; Dan Greer, safe and drug free school specialist; and Ms. Myers, the comprehensive health coordinator.

I was escorted to a small conference room where the principal gave an overview of the program. During this briefing a student, Sharika Palmer, an 8th grader in the Hair and Nails Program, instructed me on how a manicure program is implemented. Miss Sharon Samuels is one of the teacher assistants hired using Weed and Seed money, and she created the Hair and Nails Program. Coach Ron Nealis is another caring individual who was hired using these funds.

The principal has staffed the school with dedicated individuals who give unselfishly with their time and talents, including Barbara Flemming, who coaches "The Steppers," dancers; and Ms. Weaver and Ms. Faso, who coach the cheerleaders. Together they have created an after-school support group, rich with instruction in many studies and activities, and providing supervision during those critical hours when most parents are at work.

There are sports, cheerleading, dancing groups, chess clubs, and the Hair and Nail group. Unique to this program is a "neighborhood mentor," a program designed solely for those children who ride the bus to school and, consequently, must leave school at the normal time. Instead of depriving them of these special programs, arrangements were made with two neighborhood churches to allow a teacher to accompany these children and use the building for these programs. The principal has received a commitment from six churches to participate next year, meaning that after-school mentoring will reach into virtually every student's neighborhood.

The coach told us an example of a young person, a young man, who was getting D's and F's in school until he got into the coach's fitness and basketball program. Now, I am happy to say this student is an honor roll student. This last semester there are 436 students on the honor roll, and that is nearly double the numbers before this after-school program was instituted.

Not only have the students become better students, but vandalism and police calls in the area have greatly diminished. The principal is to be commended and his caring faculty and staff have indeed put the Weed and Seed money to exceptional use. I congratulate him, the staff, the faculty, and,

most importantly, the students of Howard Middle School in Ocala, Florida for a job well done. Keep up the outstanding work.

LEADERSHIP OF USPS FUMBLING ONE OPPORTUNITY AFTER ANOTHER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I came to Congress as somebody predisposed to support our Postal Service. I believe we have some of the finest men and women in the world delivering the mail, playing an important part in communities in many small and important ways. But the leadership and management of the Postal Service is fumbling one opportunity after another.

One example is their years of insensitivity to relocation issues. Because of the tremendous concern expressed by people in communities across the country, I have introduced legislation to prevent the Postal Service managers from unilaterally abandoning historical buildings and moving to strip malls at the edge of town; that they must obey local land use planning and building codes and give local citizens as much say in how the post office relates to their community as which Elvis stamp we are going to have.

If I ever needed additional evidence that the management of the Postal Service is out of touch with America, the evidence was delivered to my office last week. The Postal Service notified me that it is going to get tough with the Portland Marathon, the largest volunteer marathon in America, which raised over \$600,000 last year to benefit the special Olympics, schools, service groups, the Leukemia Society, and many other charities.

By letter, the Postal Service said that it has decided, despite a perfect record on the part of the Portland Marathon, no prior violations or complaints, despite an illegal search of the Marathon files by its postal inspectors; despite the preapproval of all the Marathon's mailings by representatives of the Postal Service, that the Portland Marathon, this group of dedicated volunteers, must pay a \$5,000 fine or face Federal trial.

What terrible scheme inspired the Postal Service to clamp down on the Marathon? What scheme so horrible that the Postal Service will pursue a case while paying many times the cost it will ever recover from the Marathon if it wins? What terrible scheme requires the Postal Service to bring down its full force on this dedicated volunteer organization without so much as a warning, with no exceptions or adjustments?

The Portland Marathon offered T-shirts and other memorabilia to some