hope that we will have similar support in the Senate and the President will sign it. Frankly this is a step in the right direction for protecting this country and for world peace.

I would like to thank the Speaker for this time to address my colleagues and to thank them for their support of this important legislation which came from the Committee on International Relations chaired by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

REQUEST FOR REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1704

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my name as a cosponsor from H.R. 1704.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unanimous consent request of the gentlewoman to remove her name as a cosponsor of H.R. 1704 cannot be granted because H.R. 1704 has been reported to the House and referred to the Union Calendar.

2000 CENSUS

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

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker I rise today to discuss the 2000 census and in particular the two lawsuits that have been generated because of the 2000 census.

As many of my colleagues know, Speaker GINGRICH and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR) each have filed a lawsuit challenging the constitutionality of the use of statistical methods when conducting a census. What my colleagues may not know is that 25 other Members of Congress who support the use of statistical methods when conducting a census have joined those two lawsuits to make sure that our position is represented in the court system.

As a Member of that group of 25, I want to give the Members of this House a status report on the two lawsuits. On Monday, April 6, 1998, the administration moved to dismiss both lawsuits on the constitutional grounds that the plaintiffs, GINGRICH and BARR, lack standing to sue the Census Bureau because they will not be harmed by the proposed plan and that the cases are not yet ripe for adjudication because the census is 2 years away.

The rhetoric from Members opposed to an accurate census suggests that the administration is hiding behind the procedural issues of standing and ripeness. This is simply not the case. As everyone knows, each case brought before a court must be reviewed procedurally before it can be reviewed on its merits. A case cannot go forward if it is not procedurally sound. The administration has repeatedly stated that it is eager to argue the merits of the case; however, it believes it has a legal obligation to also argue standing. Even if the administration did not bring up the issue of standing, a court has an obligation to dismiss a case if it is not procedurally sound, regardless of what the parties to the lawsuit allege.

My colleagues should remember that standing is also a provision of the Constitution. You cannot violate the Constitution, even with a wink and a nod, in order to get a ruling on the use of modern technology in the census.

What is not mentioned by my friends opposed to a fair and accurate census is that the administration in its motion to dismiss also argued the case on the merits, stating that the statistical method plan is both constitutional and in accord with the Census Act. Therefore, in addition to the procedural issues, the administration points out that the two cases should be dismissed on substantive issues as well.

Some of my colleagues may remember that there was a court challenge to the Line-Item Veto Act by some Members of Congress in January 1996. Congress passed the Line-Item Veto Act effective January 1996. Within the act, Congress created the right of expedited judicial review and attempted to create standing for Members of Congress.

Therefore, shortly after the effective date, some Members of Congress filed a lawsuit challenging the constitutionality of the Line-Item Veto Act. The defendants in the line-item veto case filed a motion to dismiss on procedural grounds. In that case, the Supreme Court upheld the Federal court's dismissal of the January 1996 Line-Item Veto Act challenge stating that the Members did not have standing to sue.

Likewise, with regard to the 2000 census, we have the 1998 Commerce, Justice, State Appropriations Act creating the right to expedited judicial review and attempting to create standing for Members of Congress to sue. Just like the January 1996 line-item veto case, these two lawsuits are being challenged on procedural grounds.

Constitutional scholars agree that these two cases lack the necessary procedural requirements to move forward. The courts cannot give advisory opinions as these two cases request. My anti-accurate census friends continually point to the Constitution when discussing the sampling details of the 2000 census but ignore the part of the Constitution that states that there must be a case in controversy in order for it to proceed and considered on the merits. The Constitution is very clear on that point.

I am as eager as anyone to have the courts review the substantive issues surrounding the use of modern statistical methods when conducting a census. I believe that if these cases reach the merits, the courts will determine, and the Supreme Court will uphold, that the 2000 census plan is constitutional and in accord with the Census Act. I would love to have these issues decided by the courts which are in the business of interpreting statutes and the Constitution.

In the meantime, I think it is imperative to set the record straight. Neither the administration nor the 25 Members who have joined the two lawsuits are afraid of discussing the merits of the two cases. We have said it before and we will say it again and again. The Census Bureau will obtain a fair and accurate count only by using statistical, modern methods.

This week in both the District and Virginia courts, there will be hearings at which each side will plead its case. On Thursday, arguments will be heard in Washington, D.C. and on Friday in Virginia. I am confident that we will prevail in the courts and in the court of public opinion. The American people deserve a fair and accurate census in which every person, rich or poor, black or white or Hispanic or Asian, is accounted for. The President has put forward a plan that will account for all Americans. The opponents of this plan want to repeat the errors of the past because they believe it is to their political advantage. The President's plan is true to the Constitution in both word and spirit, and it is the only plan that is fair to all people.

MANAGED CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, tonight I want to talk about the issue of managed care reform. This issue has without question become one of the most important issues on the minds of Americans today. Accordingly, it has also become one of the most pressing issues before Congress. In the last few weeks, there have been front page articles in the New York Times and in the Washington Post on the fever pitch the debate has assumed on Capitol Hill. This debate, as I will discuss tonight, has assumed a clear and identifiable framework. The debate is now one between supporters of managed care reform and the Republican leadership and insurance industry who are fighting tooth and nail to undermine the various managed care reform proposals that have been introduced. The issue has reached the dimensions it has because patients are being abused within managed care organizations. Patients today lack basic elementary protections from abuse and these abuses are occurring because insurance companies and not doctors are dictating which patients can get what services under what circumstances.

Within managed care organizations, or HMOs, the judgement of doctors is increasingly taking a back seat to the judgment of insurance companies. Medical necessity is being shunted aside by the desire of bureaucrats to make an extra buck and people are literally dying because they are not getting the