point spread, not 8 points. That was a 50 percent mistake.

How can we rely on polling? We cannot just say it is close enough for government work. We are going to spend $4 billion on a poll that is not going to be close, if it is based on the polling ideas, the President wants us to risk that, and especially since it is something that is so important and that is fundamental to our democratic system. It is just wrong.

The President did not mention that back in 1990 we attempted to use sampling. It failed in 1990. When they tried to use sampling to adjust the population enumeration, it was a failure. It was a failure because it would have, for example, taken a congressional seat away from Pennsylvania and given it away without justification, because it turned out 2 years later it was a computer error and never should have been recommended.

It also says that adjusting, based on sampling, is less accurate when you have populations of less than 100,000 people. I am sure big-city mayors may like this, but we have to work with census tracts, we have to work with smaller communities. How do we show this is going to be trustworthy?

There is another thing I was concerned about in President Clinton's comments. I do not think President Clinton means to divide America. He said that Texas would have gained $1 billion if we had used sampling. We are talking about a zero sum game. A zero sum game means if you give $1 billion to Texas, you are going to take away $1 billion from somewhere else. We only have a fixed amount of money when we get to block grants. When we take money from one area to another area, we had better explain to people why we are taking the money away.

For example, when we start adjusting the census and subtracting people from the population, which they tried to do in 1990, that is when we start making people upset and not trusting our system. We cannot use this. This is not close enough for government work. It is wrong. We need to do an actual enumeration.

E-RATE/TRUTH IN BILLING

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. Mr. Speaker, over the course of recent months, I have taken to this floor in support of one of the critical elements of the 1996 Telecommunication Act, which was an agreement that was forged between Congress and the telecommunications industry for the benefit of our schools and libraries.

It was decreed that the concept of universal service, which has been employed since 1934 to subsidize the cost of extending service to rural areas, areas that provide very high costs, would be extended to include the Internet access for our schools and libraries through a mechanism known as the E-Rate.

It was determined that the E-Rate would be paid for by the savings that would be received by the telecommunication industry as a result of deregulation.

Over the course of this last year and a half, 30,000 schools and libraries across America are seeking to capitalize on this provision in the agreement. They have put tens of thousands of dollars into developing technology plans and applying for the discounts on services they need to give America's school kids access to the information highway. This is an important opportunity to remedy the fact that barely a quarter of America's classrooms have Internet access today.

Through a mechanism that would provide discounts ranging from 20 to 80 percent based on the cost of providing service and the poverty level in the individual community, this access would be provided.

Of late we have seen a certain amount of controversy arise surrounding the FCC and its handling of the new E-Rate authority. I will be the first to admit that there are a host of management and universal service issues. There are concerns, perhaps, about the mechanism chosen by the previous FCC Chair to pursue application approval.

□ 1245

But as evidenced by the recent surcharges that have been imposed by some of the giant telecommunications companies, and the people's reaction to them, there is also some controversy over whether adequate savings have materialized to cover the E-Rate costs or whether phone companies are seeking to recoup costs they have already recovered under deregulation.

I have received and examined information from the FCC that suggests that there are already over $2 billion worth of savings that have been granted to the telecommunications industry with hundreds of millions of dollars more underway; more than enough to offset the proposed $2 billion that is currently in the pipeline of applications from our schools and libraries.

But my concern, Mr. Speaker, is that we cannot let these controversies derail the promise of Internet and the benefits for schools that were approved under the act in 1996.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today that would call for a General Accounting Office study on the actual savings and give consumers some truth in billing. It would show how much money has been saved by the telecommunication carriers as a result of these hundreds of millions of dollars in reduction. It would show how much has been passed back through to the consumers, and how much additional cost telecommunications carriers will have to bear, if any, in the implementation of the E-Rate.

In addition, my legislation would require that for those companies that seek to add additional line items to their bills, that these line items reflect the full and the accurate picture of both savings and costs to the carriers as a result of the Federal regulatory actions.

Similar language has already passed in the United States Senate, a part of their antislamming legislation, by a vote of 99-to-nothing.

The complex arguments surrounding implementation of a complex bill are hard for everybody to follow, but it will be lost on the thousands of representatives of our communities who are now operating in good faith to take advantage of what they understood to be a promise to help our schools and libraries.

We cannot end up holding our kids hostage to an intergovernmental dispute. This Congress will end up doing very little for education, the number one priority for most Americans. We must ensure that America's school kids have access to the information resources they need.

NATIONAL MEN'S HEALTH WEEK

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from Florida and had my usual town hall meeting where we have a chance to discuss issues of the day with our constituents, and one of the things I find myself frequently talking about is health care, the cost of health care, the spiraling cost of health care and its impact on the human spirit and the human condition.

Regrettably, in society, we are spending a lot of time finding ways to spend money after disease onsets the human body. We talk about prostate cancer after the fact rather than PSA tests that could quickly arrest prostate cancer in the early beginning.

I found myself this morning reading a magazine on my flight from Florida, Men's Health, and I see a new nationwide survey reveals that men are not only avoiding important health checks, they are significantly behind women in the awareness of the importance of preventive health care. A nationwide survey conducted for Men's Health Magazine and CNN by Opinion Research Corporation finds that 1 in 10 or approximately 7 million men have avoided getting regular health exams for more than a decade. Over all, slightly more than 15 million men have not had a basic health check in over 15 years.

Let us talk about some of the statistics affecting men's health. An estimated 184,500 new cases of prostate cancer will be diagnosed in 1998. At least an estimated 2.5 million men, or