



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 144

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 12, 1998

No. 59

## House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PETRI).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
May 12, 1998.

I hereby designate the Honorable THOMAS E. PETRI to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 21, 1997, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) for 5 minutes.

### CONCERNS ABOUT A FAILED CENSUS IN YEAR 2000

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to raise concerns that we are moving toward a failed census in year 2000. For over 200 years this country has conducted a decennial census, starting back with Thomas Jefferson in 1790, to count all Americans. The purpose of this census is fundamental to our democracy in this country because it is the one man/one vote belief. The only way you know you have the one man/one vote philosophy is you have to count people every 10 years.

This is the basis of elected representatives, whether it is the school board or Members of the House of Representatives, so it is so critical that we do that. Also, billions and billions of dollars that flow out of Washington or out of State capitols are based upon census information, so it is absolutely critical that we have a census that is conducted in year 2000 as one that is the most accurate possible, and as one that is trusted and believed in by the American people.

However, for the year 2000 census, the Clinton administration has proposed a radical new idea. Without the approval of Congress, they do not want to count everybody now. They have all these smart people here in Washington with all these big computers. They say we are going to use sampling and we are going to estimate the population. So for the first time in history, they are going to count less than the full population of this country, and this is where the risk is so great.

The General Accounting Office, which is the auditor for the Federal Government, a nonpartisan organization here in Washington, D.C., has said we are moving toward a failed census. Every report they have issued, they have said—the most recent one being in March—that the risk of failure has increased because they have developed this complex scheme that many of us believe cannot be completed. Even if it is completed, it will not be trusted by the American people.

We believe that the President is trying to use more political science than empirical science in developing this plan. Last week we had a hearing on the subcommittee with oversight of the census. There were two fact points I think we learned at that hearing. First was the fact that the 1990 census was not that bad of a census. It was the second most accurate census in history. But the second part of that census, which was dealing with sampling and adjustment, was a failure.

Let me explain that in a little more detail. The way they conducted the 1990 census is they went out and did an enumeration of the entire population of this country and counted 98.4 percent of the people; again, not a bad count, the second most accurate in history. Then they conducted a sample of 150,000 households. They were going to use that to adjust the total population they have just counted.

The attempt at sampling was a failure. Fortunately they did not use it, because if they had used it, for example, the original recommendation from the Census Bureau was to take a congressional seat away from the State of Pennsylvania. They find out 2 years later there was a computer mix-up that gave them the erroneous information, so they would have taken representation away from a State, Pennsylvania, falsely, because of computer error.

They also found it was less accurate when we deal with populations under 100,000. So for communities under 100,000, cities and towns for census blocks, census tracts, which is the fundamental building stone that we use to build up our congressional district as such, it is less accurate, these are the Census Bureau people telling us, in their analysis of the attempted use of sampling.

So sampling was a failure in 1990, even though the census was not bad. So what does the Clinton administration propose now? They want to totally rely on sampling. Instead of starting off counting everybody, they only want to count 90 percent of the people, so they are going to say 1 in 10 of the people we are not going to count. We are going to have 90 percent of the people.

That is starting off the sampling, and you have nothing to fall back on, because when they come up with this adjustment sample, which is going to be on 750,000 households, larger than 1990, five times as large, they plan to do it in half the amount of time. Unrealistic.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H3025

They are going to totally rely on it. If sampling fails like it did in 1990, for the year 2000 they have nothing to fall back on. They run the risk of a total failure there.

One of the things they did in 1990 is they released information on what the total census was. They showed that different parts of this country had populations deleted. For example, Bucks County up in Pennsylvania, a suburb of Philadelphia, had 3,000 people deleted from their county by the Census Bureau computers because the Census Bureau computers said, on average, they didn't deserve 3,000 people. So even though they were counted, they were subtracted. That is what upsets the people. That is the reason people say we can't trust a census where you start deleting people after they are counted.

One thing we find out now, one reason they only want to start with 90 percent of the population, is they can justify not releasing that information and showing the deletions. It is a very risky plan. It is moving towards failure. We need to share with the American people exactly the details, and we must have a census that is trusted by the American people, not the plan that has been proposed by the President.

#### THE HISPANIC VOTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. Mr. Speaker, a long time ago, American troops landed in New York and claimed it from Spain. In a proclamation to the island residents, the commander of the U.S. forces, General Nelson A. Miles, declared, "We have not come to make war upon the people of a country that for centuries has been oppressed but, on the contrary, to bring you protection, not only to yourselves but to your property, to promote your prosperity, and to bestow upon you the immunities and blessings of the liberal institutions of our government."

Taking General Miles at his word, the people of Puerto Rico sought immediately to make the promise of those immunities and blessings a reality. We were disappointed when the Foraker Act of 1900 defined the territorial relationship with the United States, and our frustration continues unabated. We have now been a territory or, as many claim, a colony for 100 years; and to our country's shame, we are still disenfranchised. We are denied that most fundamental right in a democracy, the right to vote.

Throughout the century, applying the trickle-down theory of democracy, Congress has only grudgingly extended democratic rights to the people of Puerto Rico. First we were granted citizenship in 1917 without the right to elect our own governor. Then, 31 years later, in 1948, we were allowed to elect

our own governor, but we were not allowed to exercise our right to self-determination.

I firmly believe that self-determination is one of those unalienable human rights that the Founding Fathers of this democracy held dear. It is not something that 3.8 million American citizens of Puerto Rico should have to earn or demonstrate that we deserve, though if that is the value system of this democracy, we certainly have done both by fighting and dying in this country's service and by enthusiastically and responsibly exercising our right to vote and shape our local government.

What will influence Congress? What will prompt it to act, if it is not, as I would hope, the very rightfulness of Puerto Rican self-determination? The only thing I can figure out is the voters. Voters get every politician's attention. Sadly, it is not the voters of Puerto Rico that I am speaking of, because we are denied the right to vote in presidential elections and we are denied voting representation in Congress.

However, the Hispanic or Latino vote will count. Hispanics are on their way to becoming the largest minority in this country. They represent 34 percent of the population in New Mexico, 25 percent of the population in California, 30 percent of the population in Texas, and 19 percent of the population in Arizona.

Like the U.S. citizens in Puerto Rico, Hispanics are conscientious voters. A bipartisan poll of registered Hispanic voters commissioned by Univision Communications, Inc., revealed that 94 percent of the respondents plan to vote in this year's elections.

Mark Penn, a Democrat and coauthor of the survey, with Mike Deaver, a Republican, thinks that the findings demonstrate the growing importance of Latinos in the American political process. Hispanics, he notes, provide a crucial swing vote in some of the Nation's biggest States.

I am heartened by this survey's findings that 56 percent of Latinos support statehood for Puerto Rico, whereas only 27 percent do not. I am confident that a much larger percentage of Hispanics endorse Puerto Rican self-determination. Puerto Rican self-determination is becoming a telltale issue for Hispanics, revealing a politician's attitude towards the consensus and the political empowerment of the Hispanic electorate. It is a matter of solidarity.

Members of Congress may feel they can continue to dismiss the political aspirations of the U.S. citizens of Puerto Rico with impunity, but the Hispanic vote is a growing power to be reckoned with, and the right of the U.S. citizens of Puerto Rico to self-determination is an issue that will come home to roost at the poll booth. Those that oppose the right of Puerto Ricans to self-determination will be perceived as biased or prejudiced against Hispanics.

I am asking that Members support the bill for self-determination in Puer-

to Rico. It is the right thing to do. It is the right thing to do for Republicans, it is the right thing to do for Democrats, it is the right thing to do for Congress, and above all, it is the right thing to do for the Nation.

#### TRIBUTE TO BRIGADIER GENERAL HARRY C. KESSLER

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, within these walls we debate and vote on important issues in full public view. We gather before those in the public gallery and those watching across the Nation on television, but we also do so with the spirit of millions of men and women also watching, those who have served this Nation in the Armed Forces.

These brave Americans served us during the days of the Revolutionary War, and are followed through the generation by legions, including those who today are stationed around the globe. They honor our flag of stars and stripes. That flag has changed somewhat since the days of the American Revolution, but the courage and valor of those who serve us is still the standard for the rest of the world.

This afternoon, in the gallery of this Chamber, before this great flag, I welcome the family members of one such courageous American. I ask all Americans to take a few minutes this afternoon and remember the dedicated service of Brigadier General Harry C. Kessler.

Harry Kessler's life and legacy remains important and vibrant today, more than 90 years since his death, and more than 137 years since the bold 18-year-old with a taste for adventure signed up for what would be a proud career of military and national service.

Shortly after enlisting in the 104th Pennsylvania Regiment, Harry Kessler was thrust into the American Civil War. He served as a second lieutenant in his regiment. After service at Camp Lacey, located just outside of Doylestown, Pennsylvania, he was transferred to Washington, D.C. for training. In November of 1861 he served in the Peninsula campaign of Virginia. He served in the battle of Williamsburg, as well as the battles of Fair Oaks and Seven Pines.

In 1862, now as a second lieutenant, Harry Kessler was placed in charge of confederate prisoners who he personally returned to Camp Curtin in Pennsylvania, just outside of Harrisburg. Once there, he helped to provide subsistence to the Pennsylvania troops at the battle of Gettysburg.

In 1863, at the rank of second lieutenant, Harry Kessler resigned from his regiment. In the mid-1870s, Harry Kessler joined his brother Charles in Butte, Montana. In 1876, a number of decisions that would forever change his life were made. He began to purchase