

is far too great of a risk for our men and women in uniform to assume when the security of the American people is at stake.

Mr. Speaker, may God bless America.

#### DECENNIAL CENSUS

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this week we will be debating the appropriation for the Year 2000 Decennial Census. The census is something that is required by our Constitution and is very fundamental to our entire democratic system of government, because most elected officials in America are dependent on an accurate census to be conducted.

Unfortunately, the 2000 Census has become politically involved, because President Clinton has decided to radically change the way the census is conducted, and for the first time in the history of this country, going back to Jefferson when he conducted the first census, we are not going to attempt to count everyone.

I think it would be helpful, as we begin this debate this week, to understand the Clinton budget plan and what is traditionally used where we count everybody in the census. Under the Clinton plan, as designed, and it is an interesting theory, questionnaires will be mailed out in the year April of 2000 and be mailed back in. The expectation is that we will get maybe 65 percent response rate, though that is in question because when the American people realize that we are not going to count everybody, that we are going to use polling and sampling, the response rate may be significantly affected. But let us hope they get a 65 percent response rate.

Then we do what is called a non-response follow-up. But what the Clinton plan is proposing is instead of trying to follow up on everybody in this country, they are going to automatically delete, not count, 10 percent of the population. So that means about 27 million people will not be included in the census. Let me repeat that. Mr. Speaker, 27 million people will not be included in the census under President Clinton's plan. He will only count up to 90 percent of the population and he will use cloning to create the mysterious 10 percent. He is going to clone 10 percent of the population, 10 percent of the population.

Now, the 10 percent that is not counted is not the hard-to-count people. Some people say, oh, those are the hard-to-count people. These are a randomly-selected 10 percent where maybe people are on vacation, they are not in town or something, and they do not complete their questionnaire. So they are going to be potentially not counted. That is just not the right way to do that.

So, Mr. Speaker, once they have cloned in that 10 percent of the population, they will then do what is called an ICM sample of 750,000 households. The 750,000-household count will then be used to adjust the clone numbers to get what they think would be the right number.

In 1990, they used something with only 150,000 households. This time they are going to take a sample five times larger, but they are going to do it in half the time. It is very unrealistic. In fact, the whole plan is extremely risky and is moving towards failure.

The General Accounting Office and the Inspector General have both warned this is a high-risk plan and the risk of failure is very high.

Now, let me go back to the way it has been done in the past where we make an effort to count everyone. In 1990, they sent out the questionnaire as they would propose this time in the year 2000, but this time the key is going to be the mailing lists. We realize that about 50 percent of the problem back in 1990 was the mailing list, and so the Census Bureau is putting new efforts and new ideas into doing that. In fact, there is \$100 million of extra money to let the Census Bureau go out and verify the addresses. So we are going to do a better job to help address that part of the problem.

There will be paid advertising this time around to help encourage the response rate and, hopefully, under full enumeration, we can do a second mailing of questionnaires and even get a higher response rate. Then, when we go to nonresponse follow-up, say we get a 65 percent rate or 70 percent, when we do the follow-up, we are going to try to count everybody, not try to delete 27 million and create them by cloning. We are going to go out and use whatever efforts we need and resources, and that means using administrative records.

If we have an undercount of children, which we did have, let us work with the WIC program and the Medicaid program. There are ways to go about doing this. This is hard work. Let us also make it easier to use people from the local communities to participate in the program.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) has a proposal, which we are working with her on, to help support and to help people who say they are receiving food stamps or welfare benefits to not lose those benefits when they work part-time for the Census Bureau. So in the Haitian community in Miami, we want Haitians to go out to help count Haitians, and this makes it possible.

So, there are a lot of things that can be done to improve upon the 1990 census, but the important thing is let us count everybody, because everyone counts. It is just plain wrong to not count 27 million people, and say we have all of these big fancy computers with all of these academic intellectuals up here who know how to clone people and create a virtual population of America. It is just not right.

We need to work this in a bipartisan fashion. We do not need a Democratic census. We do not need a Republican census. We need an American census. I hope when we debate the Mollohan amendment, we realize that the right way to do this is to work together to count all Americans.

#### OPPORTUNITY FOR MEANINGFUL CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, tonight this Chamber has the opportunity to vote for meaningful campaign finance reform. Tonight, Members of this House will cast one of the most important votes of their careers in this House: To help restore integrity to our democratic system of government. That is what this debate is about tonight, to help restore some integrity to our democratic process.

Mr. Speaker, the vote we will be casting tonight is on legislation that was introduced by Senator MCCAIN and Senator FEINGOLD in the Senate, and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) and myself in the House, along with a number of other sponsors.

The McCain-Feingold bill in the Senate had a majority of Members who sought to support this legislation, but were not able to break the filibuster because they felt that the House would never deal with this issue, so why should the Senate take it up. But tonight, this House has the opportunity to pass the McCain-Feingold legislation, the Meehan-Shays legislation as it is referred to in the House.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation bans soft money. It completely eliminates the soft money contributions, the unlimited sums from individuals, corporations, labor unions and other interest groups that go to the political parties. In recent years these contributions have been rerouted right back down to help the individual candidates. This makes a mockery of our campaign laws which, under our constitutional form of government, provide for limitation of campaign contributions. Those limits are ignored because of our failure to ban soft money to the political parties.

The second thing this legislation does is it recognizes the sham issue ads for what they truly are: campaign ads. They are not sham campaign ads; they are truly campaign ads. They are sham issue ads. In other words, issue ads are able to circumvent the campaign law, because they do not say "vote for" or "vote against." Yet they are clearly campaign ads.

Under our bill any ad run 60 days to an election that names or pictures a federal candidate is a campaign ad and is called such. In addition, any ad that expresses "unambiguous and unmistakable support for" or "opposition to" a