

before the bombing. Today they number about 640,000.

As the Serbian sweep through Kosovo began and tens of thousands of refugees poured into Albania and Macedonia, Secretary of Defense William Cohen asserted, "We are not surprised," making one wonder why NATO was so utterly unprepared for something it had expected. In fact, a high-ranking administration official admits frankly, "Anyone who says that we expected the kinds of refugee flows that we saw is smoking something."

What Milosevic planned was a campaign called Operation Horseshoe. It was to be a larger version of a brutal offensive in 1998 that attacked and destroyed KLA strongholds and killed, terrorized and expelled civilians in areas that supported the group. Most Western observers—including the CIA and the United Nations—estimated that this ugly action would result in an outflow of a maximum of 100,000 refugees abroad.

The decision to wage an air war against Milosevic involved a fateful preliminary move. The 1,375 international observers posted in Kosovo had to abandon the province, as did all Western journalists and diplomats. Brussels and Washington may not have recognized what this meant, but people on the ground did. As one Kosovar said to a departing British journalist: "From now on it's going to be a catastrophe for us, because the [observers] have gone."

The human tragedy that resulted should teach a sobering lesson to all those who goaded the administration to stop planning and start bombing, who urge that force be used as a first resort in such crises and who want military might used as an expression of moral outrage. Being righteous, it turns out, does not absolve one of the need to set clear and attainable political goals, relate your means to them and make backup plans. The philosopher Max Weber once noted that a statesman is judged not by his intentions but by the consequences of his actions. It is well and good to clamor for a blood-and-guts foreign policy, but until now it has been Western guts and Kosovar blood.

If only we would use ground troops, some hawks now respond, none of this would have happened. And certainly the decision to go to war carelessly and in haste, before massing ground troops in Albania and Macedonia, was a historic blunder. Ground troops would have proved a potent threat. But even with troops, the war would have begun with days of airstrikes. And it would have been near impossible to invade Kosovo while hundreds of thousands of refugees were swarming across its roads, bridges and mountain paths.

Those who still advocate the use of ground troops today speak of its military benefits, which are real. They do not, however, mention its costs, which are political. A ground invasion would fracture NATO. Germany, Italy and Greece are strongly opposed to the use of ground troops. A majority of Italians and more than 95 percent of Greeks are opposed even to the airstrikes. An invasion would probably split Germany's governing coalition. Russia and China would both actively oppose it and veto any U.N. involvement with Kosovo.

These are staggering obstacles, and not because Washington should pander to Chinese or Russian prerogatives. The eventual settlement in Kosovo—even after an invasion—will have to be a political one, involving Yugoslavia, its neighbors and other major powers. (Remember the strategic goal was to bring stability to the region.) It will be a more durable, lasting settlement if it is not a unilat-

eral American fiat. Even in the gulf war, even in World War II, the endgame was as much political as it was military.

Of course, Washington could just go ahead and do whatever it wanted. It is certainly powerful enough. But it would mean not just as American invasion of Yugoslavia itself, but also its occupation—it used to be called colonialism. The problem, of course, is that as America gets sucked deeper and deeper into the Balkans, one has to ask, is it worth it? Even if we have "self-created" interests in the Balkans, are they of a magnitude to justify a full-scale war, massive reconstruction and perpetual peacekeeping? Sen. John McCain urges that we fight the war "as if everything were at stake." But everything is not at stake. One cannot simply manufacture a national emergency. For seven weeks now the war has been going badly, during which time the stock market has hit record highs, a powerful indication that most Americans do not connect even a faltering war in the Balkans with their security. (By contrast, markets everywhere reeled last July when Russia announced merely that it was defaulting on its debts.)

What about American credibility? Concerns about America's reputation and resolve are serious—which is why we must end this intervention with some measure of success. But credibility is often the last refuge of bad foreign policy. When policy is no longer justifiable on its merits, people shift gears and say, well, if we don't win at all costs we will lose face. But what about the loss of face in continuing a failing mission? A variant of the credibility logic holds that dictators around the world will be emboldened if America does not win decisively. But would they? America won a spectacular victory in the gulf war, televised live across the globe. It didn't seem to deter the Serbs, the Croats, the Somalis, the Sudanese, the Azerbaijani, among others. Whether America wins or loses a particular contest, the world will keep turning, bringing forth new dictators and new crises. Global deterrence against instability is a foolish and futile goal. It sets America up for failure.

In the weeks ahead, despite the Chinese disaster, NATO must intensify the air war—and hit tanks and troops. It must also intensify its negotiations. The careful use of diplomacy might well resolve what the careless use of force has not. (If the Senate acts speedily on his nomination as U.N. ambassador, Richard Holbrooke's considerable skills could prove invaluable.) During this intervention, many have made analogies to the Vietnam War. Some are more appropriate than others. What is most relevant, however, is not how we entered that war but rather how we left it. After four presidents had made commitments to the people of South Vietnam, in 1973 Washington abruptly abandoned them to a terrible fate. This time let us be clear; our obligations now are not to vague notions of credibility and deterrence. We have a specific commitment to the people of Kosovo to negotiate a decent settlement for them and help rebuild their country. Western nations will have to provide assistance to the southern Balkans as a whole (minus Serbia for now). America having paid for most of the war, Europe should pay for most of the peace, but it must happen in any case. It is not a commitment that requires that we send in ground troops or pay any price, but it is one we cannot walk away from. There is an answer to the legitimate question: why should we be involved in this crisis? Because we made it worse.

THE 2000 CENSUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege tonight to address a very important matter that seems to have been forgotten with the current crisis in Kosovo and some of the pressing matters before the Congress. That is the Census. Today is May 12, 1999. We are just 10 months and 19 days away from the official beginning of the 2000 Census.

Article 1, Section 2 of the United States Constitution requires the Census to be conducted every 10 years for the purpose of reapportioning seats in Congress among the States. Since the Supreme Court's decision in 1962, one man-one vote, the ruling in Baker versus Carr, census data has also been used for redrawing legislative boundaries to seek equal population and fair representation in each legislative district.

This country has come a long way since the first Census was conducted in 1790. Back then there were no address lists, no maps, not even a mailout questionnaire. Instead, the U.S. Marshals traveled on horseback as they individually counted the population of the original 13 States.

The 2000 Census will be the 22nd national census, and it will be the largest peacetime mobilization in the United States since the Great Depression. The 2000 Census will consist of counting 275 million United States residents at 120 million households, more than half a million Census takers, 500 local Census offices, with 12 regional Census centers and four data processing centers, 500 local area networks with 6,000 personal computers, 8 million maps, 79 million questionnaires, and 8 to 9 million blocks across the country.

With the annual fate of \$180 billion Federal dollars resting on the accuracy of the 2000 Census, the importance of this historic undertaking is all too clear. The 1990 Census 10 years ago resulted in 26 million errors. Thirteen million people were counted in the wrong place, 4.4 million people were counted twice, and 8.4 million were missed. The majority of those that were missed were poor people, children, and minorities.

The national net undercount was 1.6 percent of the total population. That is 4 million Americans, 4 million people, who simply did not count. Minorities were undercounted at levels considerably above the national average. Five percent of Hispanics were missed, 4.5 percent of American Indians, 4.4 percent of African Americans, and 2.3 percent of Asian and Pacific Islanders were not counted.

Even more unfortunate is the fact that children were missed nearly twice

as often as adults, and again, minority children had the highest undercounts, and later we will discuss the repercussions.

We cannot and should not allow this to happen again. That is why I agree with President Clinton, that improving the Census should not be a partisan issue. It is not about politics, it is about people. It is about making sure that every American really, literally counts.

We must support the Census Bureau and its plan to incorporate the use of modern scientific methods and an aggressive enumeration process to provide the most accurate count possible. Otherwise, the voiceless will continue to have no voice in this country, the unrepresented will continue to be unrepresented, and the American dream will remain just that, just a dream, never a reality, for those who are not counted.

Joining me tonight in this effort is my neighbor and my colleague, and my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CIRO RODRIGUEZ). I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ).

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding to me. It is a pleasure to be with him tonight. I want to congratulate him on his efforts as we move forward on this important issue.

As the gentleman well indicated, we recognize that every 10 years this country has an obligation to make sure that everyone gets counted. I want to share with the Members in terms of where we find ourselves now.

The gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT) recently submitted a proposal that indicated that he wanted to move forward on the Census and to let the courts resolve the remaining issues.

Why should we let the courts resolve the issues? I was real pleased to see Democratic leader, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. GEPHARDT) offer a counterproposal that includes three components of a compromise on the Census. I want to share these three components.

The first one is to completely lift the current June 15 cutoff of funding for 1999, Commerce, Justice, State appropriations at the earliest possible opportunity. We need to allow this agency to move forward. For us to cut the funding on June 15 is going to have a detrimental effect on the Census and being able to do an accurate Census, thereby allowing full funding for the rest of the fiscal year. It is only the most appropriate thing we can do.

Secondly, we should provide full funding for the year 2000 Census Bureau activities within the normal 2000 Commerce-Justice-State appropriations process without limiting or any other conditions. We should not wait on the court. We have an obligation to

do the count as quickly as possible and as accurately as possible.

Thirdly, to also incorporate into a single compromise authorization bill those elements of the act, which is the America Counts Today, and initiatives proposed by Republicans that are consistent with what the Census Bureau has determined is necessary to conduct an accurate and complete 2000 Census. So it becomes important that we do not play politics with the Census, and that we make sure that everyone gets counted in the process.

Members heard earlier the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) indicate the disparities that occurred in the 1990 Census and how individuals were left behind. As a direct result of this undercount, many individuals were effectively denied government representation and many communities were adversely affected on Federal and State resources by schools, crime prevention, health care, and transportation.

One of the things that we need to recognize is that the count, the 2000 count, just like the 1990 count, is utilized for the purposes of distribution of resources, as well as reapportionment and determination of the number of Congressmen, for example, that each of the States will entail.

Based on projections now, Texas has indicated we might have up to two additional Congressmen. If we look at an appropriate count, and if we look at the number that we lost last time, there is a possibility that we might even get a third congressman. Texas was the one that had one of the highest figures of individuals that were undercounted, so it becomes really important for us to recognize the importance of this issue.

I also want to take this opportunity to appeal to the churches, the organizations, the neighborhood groups, the PTAs, the schools, the advocacy groups, to participate, to make sure that everyone gets counted as we move forward to the year 2000.

All of the groups and a lot of the experts that we have have indicated the importance of utilizing the most advanced methods to assure that this count can be the most accurate. If we do not utilize those methods, then we are bound to have even a worse situation before us than we had in the 1990s.

I want to share a couple of quotes. One comes from the Report of the Panel on Census Requirements in the Year 2000 and Beyond, Committee on National Statistics. This is the National Academy of Sciences.

They are quoted as saying: "Physical enumeration or pure 'counting' has been pushed well beyond the point at which it adds to the overall accuracy of the census. . . Techniques of statistical estimation can be used, in combination with the mail questionnaire and reduced scale of follow-up of nonrespondents, to produce a better census at reduced costs."

Remember, this sampling only occurs in those areas where, after everyone has had an opportunity to receive the mail and be able to respond, these are the areas of the nonrespondents, where they have a process of calling them, of visiting them, and continuing to visit them, and then doing a sample.

One of the things that I also want to mention, of the undercount, one of the biggest populations that is undercounted is children. So in those areas, especially urban areas and rural areas that are poor areas, usually they are the ones that are undercounted.

In areas of people that are a little more wealthy, that have several households, usually we have an overcount there, so there is a need for estimates and statistical data to be used in order to get a more accurate count.

Grassroot campaigns need to be undertaken to make sure we educate everyone in this process, but we as a Congress have an obligation to move now, before June 15, to make sure that we fund it appropriately. Not to move now is negligent on our part. To wait for the courts to make a decision, they did not elect us for that purpose. They elected us to make the decisions as we see fit, and to do the right thing. That is to move forward on the year 2000.

□ 2030

I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) for allowing me to make a few comments today on this very key issue that has an impact on everyone, not only just for some individuals but the entire community and the entire United States.

This particular issue of the 2000 Census once again has an impact on the number of resources that come into the community, the representation that we get, and also in terms of the redistricting that occurs.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I also wish to point out something that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) touched on, and that is that numerous organizations support the Census Bureau's plan to utilize the modern scientific method. These are proven, reliable means.

Some of these organizations are as follows: the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, the National Association of Latino Elected Officials, the Mexican-American Legal Defense Fund, the Rainbow Push Coalition, the NAACP, the National Puerto Rican Coalition, the National Congress of American Indians, the America Federation of Teachers, the National Education Agency, the American Civil Liberties Union, the Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance, the National Council of Senior Citizens, and many more organizations recognize the importance of an accurate census. Of course, they are making their voices heard.

Congress, by the same token, has a duty and obligation to listen to all of the people and these organizations.

I am glad that, again, we have another voice that is sounding loud and clear, and that is the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES).

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES).

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, the census should not be a political game. The census should not be used as a political football to decide who is up and who is down. The stakes are too high in this issue.

As we all know, the census is the basis for almost all demographic information about the United States. Our government uses census data to decide which local communities need Federal funding for WIC, Head Start, Safe and Drug Free school funding, Medicaid, and other important programs.

Each of our communities will be hurt if there is an unfair and inaccurate census. Equally important, minorities across the Nation will be hurt by an inaccurate and unfair census.

In my State of Texas, 486,028 people were not counted in the last census. This undercount cost the State of Texas more than \$934 million in Federal funds alone. My district, El Paso County, had an undercount of more than 25,000 and perhaps as high as 40,000 people that were not counted. Nationwide, my congressional district ranks 17th out of all the congressional districts which were undercounted.

As we have heard many times, the 1990 census, which used the conventional head count method, missed over 8 million people. Mr. Speaker, over 8 million people were missed in the last census; 4.4 percent of African Americans, 5 percent of Hispanic, 4.5 percent of Native Americans, 2.3 percent of Asian Americans, and 3.2 percent of children were missed in the last census.

Democrats want a fair, accurate, and complete census that counts everyone. To accomplish this, Democrats, the scientific community, and the Census Bureau favor using both the conventional head count method and the modern scientific method of statistical sampling in the 2000 Census.

It appears, however, that Republicans do not want an accurate census. They seem to be worried that it will endanger a fragile majority in Congress.

As I have said earlier, the census is too important to be used as a political football. This should not be a Democrat versus Republican issue.

Experts support the use of sampling. The National Academy of Sciences recently released the first report from the fourth panel to review the Census Bureau's plans for the 2000 Census. Once again, the experts convened by the Academy endorse the Census Bureau's plan to use scientific evaluation and to provide a correct census as a basis for their counts.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that we stop playing games and start taking care of those who need an accurate count, those in Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California. It has become common knowledge that those communities that suffer most are those communities along our border. We owe all Americans this basic right to be counted in the next census.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, we keep going back to the undercount, and it is quite serious for certain States more so than others, but this is an American problem because we are talking about Americans not being counted, and we are talking about individuals not being represented.

It is not just Texas, though I am going to dwell on Texas a little longer since I am from San Antonio and it has impacted my community more so than many others. But it is Arizona. The 1990 census missed more than 89,000 people in Arizona. In Florida, they missed 258,900 people. In New York, 271,500 people. California, 834,000 people were missed.

In a minute, I will tell my colleagues why that is so important, which has already been touched on by my colleagues. But let me go ahead and expand a little bit on some of the specifics.

The 1990 census resulted in an undercount of 482,000 Texans. Texas trailed only California as the State with the highest undercount. Of those 382,000 missed individuals, 228,300 children were missed in Texas. In my hometown of San Antonio, there were 38,100 people missed. Nearly half, 16,600 of those were children. That is enough, a number of children, to fill 29 schools with a total of 1,042 teachers. That is in San Antonio alone.

If we estimate as \$650 in Federal resources annually per child, San Antonio unjustly lost \$10,790,000 that should have gone to educate our children. We keep talking about money; and people say, oh, is this just about money? Maybe it is, in large measure. What is so unfair about that?

These are our tax dollars that flow from San Antonio, that flow from the State of Texas to the Federal Government. The Federal Government then devises a method of which they then allocate back to the States and to the cities. But if they are not counting us, we will never get what is justly ours. It is our contribution. This is what we should be getting back from the Federal Government as an investment in what we have put out.

The 1990 undercount cost Texas \$1 billion in Federal funds. If the 2000 Census results in an equally unfair count, Texas stands to lose an additional \$2.18 billion in population-based Federal funds. This is simply not fair to Texans. It is not fair to San Antonians. Beyond that, it is not fair to our children.

I keep saying Texans and San Antonians, but it really is all Ameri-

cans. This is not a country that should, for whatever reason, whether we attribute it to political gain or to extract some sort of political advantage, that we should elevate that to the cost and the expense of educating our children, also funds for hospitals, for medical care, for our farmers, for our ranchers. It goes on and on.

I will be happy in a minute to highlight and explain to my colleagues how census figures translate to proportional amounts of money being deprived of those individuals who actually contribute to the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from San Antonio, Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) to engage in a dialogue. I know I have gone over some points especially when it comes to children. I know how dedicated the gentleman is to education and education issues. I am aware that the gentleman taught for over 10 years. He was an educator. I am also aware that his wife is also an educator.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is right. I have been an educator. I taught at Our Lady of the Lake University at the university level. My wife teaches first grade.

One of the key things to remember is that the census did not count the largest number of youngsters that were missed, that were the students and those youngsters. When we look at the amount of resources that come in based on what they call ADA, Average Daily Attendance, and other figures, they utilize the population figures to determine some resources for those areas. So if those youngsters are not counted, then we lose out on that, those resources that would go directly to those individuals in the form of access to health care, in the form of access to education, in the form of access to extracurricular types of programs that youngsters can participate in.

Let me just share, what is at question is the whole concept of trying to do the most accurate, complete 2000 Census. That should be our objective. I know the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) would agree with me that that is what we need to do, to make sure everyone gets counted.

We also recognize, and all the people that have been involved in it, from the Academy of Science to all, they recognize that there is a need to use sampling and statistical method to determine that.

The Carter administration, the Bush administration, the Clinton administration all concluded that the Constitution permits the use of sampling and other methods or statistical methods as part of the census. They utilized that in the past.

In addition, one of the other things that is also important is that all courts that have considered the question have

concluded that the Census Bureau may use sampling and other statistical methods to prove the accuracy and good faith and direct accounting of individuals.

Again, what is at question is to make sure that everyone gets counted and as accurately as possible. What the fight seems to be all about is politics and trying to determine that maybe certain States should not get as many congressmen as they are getting, to determine whether certain areas, as we draw the lines for the year 2000, as we draw the lines for every congressional district and all the other elected officials' districts, that that population utilization, if it is the areas that are poor areas that do not get counted, then those areas are going to be over-represented in comparison to some of the other areas that have some of the more middle to upper income brackets, so that we will have congressional districts that will be way over the population figures than some of the others.

So that will create a disparity, not only in terms of representation, but a disparity as it deals with the funding. So the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) has hit it right on the nail in terms of the fact that we need to make sure that we get the appropriate consensus.

Now the other thing that really we need to bring to light is the fact that we should not drag our feet, and we should be funding the census now. We should not be waiting and try to just fund them the next 6 months and the next 6 months, because that is creating some real serious problems; and that is definitely going to have an impact on whether we do a good job or not. I know the gentleman from Texas would agree with me.

The Census Bureau has been moving to try to streamline. In fact, we have been told that, for the Year 2000, the standard census form will be the shortest in 150 years. So they are already trying to streamline it to make it simpler. It will only have six questions. So that becomes important. Each individual is going to be getting that.

Where we have the difficulty is the nonrespondents. When we talk about the census, everything that we have done in the past, and that is the direct mail, the follow-up, the calls, the visits to those household that are non-respondent, all that is going to be done.

But when all that is said and done, one of the key things is that we still had a problem in the 1990 census, and we want to make sure that we try to correct that as much as possible. That is why the statistical sampling is one of the areas that we need to make sure that is utilized so that we can get a more accurate count. I know that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) would agree with me.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, that is the important thing about this whole

debate. We debated in the past in this Chamber on the floor here, and I do not think we have ever had a legitimate debate questioning the methodology that is to be utilized by the Census Bureau. This is a methodology that has been endorsed, accepted, approved, certified by the National Academy of Science.

It is not a question of legitimacy of the application of the methods. No one is really going to be attacking that. The reason they are not going to is because they surely will adopt it and want to use it in other areas. It is not a legitimate, well-founded and valid argument. So my colleagues are not going to hear that.

What it really comes down to, and I know that the American people would like to think there are certain issues that rise above political considerations. Kosovo is one of them, and it is important to us. It is not a Democratic issue, and it is not a Republican issue. The census is one when we are talking about the lives, the well-being, the quality of life, a standard of living for all Americans. It is not Republican. It is not Democratic. It is a people issue.

□ 2045

It is a people issue, and we should not do harm and injustice to it by somehow politicizing it and extracting partisan advantage, or perceived partisan advantage, because I do not believe that there really is any partisan advantage to either kind of fight on some of these issues, and the census does not lend itself to it.

Over and above the methodology that is going to be utilized by the Census Bureau, I also wish to touch on the community outreach, what the Census Bureau is doing to engage local communities, to gain the input of the local governments to assist them in making sure we have an accurate count early on. Because as the gentleman has indicated, if we drag our feet on this we cannot meet the certain deadlines. We will not have an accurate census count.

So I do want to go over some of the partnerships. Many of these effective partnerships have already been established with the Census Bureau and the following organizations. The American Association of Retired Persons, the Mexican-American Legal Defense Fund, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the National Congress of American Indians, the National League of Cities, and dozens more have joined forces with the Census Bureau and other cities' governments across the Nation to educate people about the census.

This year the Census Bureau is looking to build upon the success of its previous partnership programs. Just last week the Census Bureau announced its partnership with Goodwill Industries, a national nonprofit organization who trained 320,000 people last year. Goodwill Industries has become known for

training and placing former welfare recipients that will now assist the Census Bureau in its efforts to hire and train some of the nearly 850,000 census workers needed to conduct the 2000 Census.

We all need to work to assist the Census Bureau in establishing these partnerships with governments, organizations and businesses in our own districts. There is more to this effort by the Census Bureau, and I commend the Census Bureau for going out there in their outreach effort. There is also what is referred to as Census in the Schools, and it is a project that will strive to educate students about the census, its importance to them, their education, their families and their communities, and it is a darned good place to start in terms of education.

The goal is to increase participation by involving schools, teachers and students and engaging the parents. And there is no better way to get a parent's attention than to work it through the children and what is in their best interests.

In addition, the Census in the Schools project will serve as another tool to recruit some of the nearly 850,000 workers that will be needed to conduct the 2000 Census. Many of the schools across the country have already received information about the project, and I know that we will be visiting San Antonio and going to the schools and promoting the partnership program. For those who have not received the information, the education materials are available on the Census Bureau's web page, and that is www.census.gov, for government.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. If the gentleman will yield, I wanted to indicate also the importance of the role that the community plays, and that is that every church, every minister, every organization out there has a role and a responsibility.

And I am glad the gentleman mentioned in terms of the involvement of the schools. I think there is going to be a need for all of us to make sure we all have that obligation, to make sure we all get counted. And when that form comes in, the sooner we can send it in, the better.

There is no doubt that if we do not send it in, we are going to get called, we are going to get mailed again, we are going to get visited, and we are going to get visited, and we are going to get visited, and we are going to get visited. So I think it is important that when we get the particular mail out on the census that we fill it out as quickly as possible and send it in.

Neighborhood groups can play a very significant role. Earlier the gentleman was mentioning about the importance of what the experts are saying, and I want to quote a couple of things. This particular quote is from the U.S. General Accounting Office and it says,

"Sampling households that fail to respond to questionnaires produces substantial cost savings and should improve final data quality." That is the U.S. General Accounting Office in support of the use of statistical methods.

I also want to quote a little bit from the U.S. Department of Commerce, the Honorable Frank DeGeorge, Inspector General, that says, "The Census Bureau has adopted a number of innovations to address the problem of past censuses; declining accuracy and rising costs. One innovation, which we fully support, is the use of statistical sampling for non-response follow-up." Those individuals that do not respond to those questionnaires initially.

Let me also quote from the American Statistical Association, where they say, "Because sampling potentially can increase the accuracy of the count while reducing costs, the Census Bureau has responded to the Congressional mandate by investigating the increased use of sampling. We endorse the use of sampling for these purposes; and it is consistent with the best statistical practice."

There are some additional individuals that have continued to indicate, and I want to read from the panel that evaluates alternative census methodologies, the National Research Council, and they state, "Change is not the enemy of an accurate and useful census; rather, not changing methods as the United States changes would inevitably result in a seriously degraded census." So we run the risk of having one of the worst censuses ever in the Year 2000 if we do not allow both the appropriate funding to go as quickly as possible.

We need to move forward, instead of just putting a stop to it in June. We need to try to move it quickly, and also to allow the census itself to work. Politicians should not be involved in trying to dictate to them as to what they should or should not do. They should know what some of the best approaches are and they are the ones that should be able to do the job that needs to be done, and that is to make sure that every American gets counted.

Again, if we ask why it is so important, this is one of the constitutional obligations, as the gentleman well knows, that we have as a Congress, to make sure that every 10 years everyone gets counted. So it becomes real important.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I could not agree with the gentleman more.

We have gone over about the proven scientific method. I do not think there is any real legitimate attack on it. But I want to assure Members of the House, of course, that every effort will be made to go to the neighborhoods, to make sure the questionnaires are returned and they are answered. We will do everything that is humanly possible for an accurate head count.

But beyond that, we already know that is not accurate, and it is not going to result in accurate numbers for us. Knowing that, we have a proven, reliable method of establishing accurate numbers. There are many things that are out there now, and people may question, they may be worried when they hear the word "sampling", "scientific method", but I have already gone over that the National Academy of Sciences has approved it. This is something that the Bush administration even approved and sanctioned.

Even on the floor of this House, does anyone think that the writers of the Constitution, the framers of the Constitution, those individuals, those great geniuses, ever envisioned that we would be casting our votes electronically; that we would use this card that I hold in my hand; that we would put it in a slot and vote "yes", "no" or "present", and it would be going up on some electronic board; that these numbers would be calculated? I am sure there would be individuals that would question that alone, that advance in technology, which speeds things along in this House. No doubt. The reason we trust it is because it is proven. It is reliable. We have tested it. And that is all we can ask of any method or any manner that we utilize today; that it be based on the best scientific method that is available to us; that it is proved correct and accurate time and time again.

Many individuals do not understand how important it is to have an accurate census and how it affects their individual lives. I am going to enumerate how these numbers are used year in and year out, and the most important thing to remember is that the census is decennial in nature. That means every 10 years. If we do not get it right that year, we have to live with those numbers for 10 years, just as Texas has lived with them for 10 years at a cost of a billion dollars to our children, our farmers, our ranchers and our citizens. We cannot repeat those mistakes.

Census numbers are required to enforce provisions under the Civil Rights Act, which prohibits discrimination based upon race, sex, religion and national origin. They are used by the Department of Veterans Affairs for State projections on the need for hospitals, nursing homes, cemeteries and other benefits for veterans. State and county agencies use the data to plan for eligibility under Medicare and Medicaid programs. Census data is used to determine the distribution of funds to develop programs for people with disabilities and the elderly under the rehabilitation act. Census data is used in evaluating the impact of immigration on the economy and the job market. The Small Business Administration uses census data to distribute funds for small business development centers. So important to our economy, since we

know that over 85 percent of all businesses are truly small in nature.

Census data is used to help determine the effects of bank mergers under the Community Reinvestment and Bank Holding Company Acts. Census data is used by local governments to project the need for services such as fire and police services.

These are just a few of the number of ways census data is used.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Let me share with the gentleman, and what the gentleman just indicated is correct, that for those individuals that were not counted, for each individual, the figures are different for each State, but it has been estimated that in Texas if an individual was not counted, we lost \$1900 for that individual for that year. So when we look at the whole decade, we can see a tremendous amount of dollars for each individual that was not counted. So that it adds up.

The gentleman was mentioning each of the programs. It is over a total of \$180 billion of Federal funds that are at stake in terms of distribution and how that should go out. So that what is before us is not only in terms of resources and programs, but also, again, the whole issue of reapportionment.

And reapportionment means we have 435 Congressmen, so many from each State based on population. And I know that for those States that are growing it is important, and for the other States it is also important to know how many people reside in those States. I know that that is one of the biggest problems that some of the people have with their areas, and it should not be political, it should be about making sure people get counted appropriately and accurately.

So, again, in Texas we are scheduled to receive two additional Congressmen, if not three, and that would be based on the count. From the preliminary figures we have seen, we will gain at least two additional Congressmen because of the increase in population. I think that has a direct impact on representation in the State of Texas as well as throughout the country, California and the other States that are also impacted.

One of the things I wanted to share was that when we talk to people, we are not saying that we should not go and not do the traditional things. The census is still going to go out there and make sure that everyone gets their mail out, makes sure that everyone is followed up with a call if they do not respond, and if they still do not respond, that everyone gets a knock on their door. It is an effort that is extremely costly, but we also recognize that statistical methods work in determining a better accuracy.

In addition to that, there is going to be some additional advertising resources that are going to be utilized to make sure that people understand the

importance of getting counted. And again, remember, if an individual does not get counted, we lose resources because of that. And for all practical purposes, that individual does not exist. And I think it is important that all individuals recognize that they have an obligation not only for themselves and for their families, but for their entire community, to make sure that everyone gets counted.

That is why organizations come into play, the ministers, the churches, and everyone has a role to play in educating ourselves about the importance of getting counted.

□ 2100

I want to also share with my colleagues that the same methods that have been utilized in the past are going to be utilized but, in addition to that, to get that better accurate count is sampling statistical methods and to look at going to the courts to try to throw that out just means that the 2000 census will even be worse than the 1990 census that lost a large number of individuals that were not counted. And my colleagues heard some of those figures.

Now, we also recognize that the Hispanic population is one of the ones that was the most undercounted, with about 5 percent, the African-American population with 4.4, the Asian population with 4.5. And again, low-income individuals, whether they are minority or not, are the ones that are least likely to get counted. And those that are above in the economic bracket usually get over counted because of the fact they have several households.

So it becomes important that we look at that as seriously as possible and we ask that the Congress seriously look at this and move forward and assure that the funding comes directly to the Census Bureau and that the politicians stay away from dictating as to what should be happening and the Census Bureau and the individuals that have been doing that and have the education and have the expertise in that area should be the ones dictating what should happen.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I could not agree with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) more on that observation.

In summary, I just want to reemphasize some things. I do not believe there is any legal impediment to the utilization of the modern scientific method for the purposes of redistricting and, of course, the distribution of Federal funds. That goes unquestioned. If people want to take it to the courts, that is a right, as we enjoy so many in our democracy.

But again, if it is done for the wrong purposes, if it is just done to delay, to frustrate and thwart an accurate census so we have inaccurate numbers for 10 years, that is wrong. I do not believe it is American and I think it is abuse of

the system. And if we ever had frivolous litigation, that is frivolous litigation.

I am going to wrap this up by going over other uses of these numbers because they truly are numbers that translate and affect the lives of human beings, though. Community agencies use the census data to target areas that need special programs, such as Meals on Wheels. The data is also used to allocate funds for programs that promote educational equality for women and girls under the Women's Educational Equity Act. And it creates prevention of violence against women's programs dealing with, of course, prevention and post-trauma assistance.

The Department of Health and Human Services uses data in its assistance program. Census data is used by State governments to support juvenile justice and create delinquency prevention programs. The Department of Education uses the information for preparing a report to Congress on the social and economic status of children served by different local school districts.

If they have faulty underlying data, they are not getting accurate information on which Congress can act. And local governments use the data to implement programs such as Head Start.

As we can see, virtually no one in this country goes untouched by the effects of an accurate or an inaccurate census, for that matter. We have all been elected to represent our constituencies and to represent their best interests. An accurate census is in our constituents' best interest.

It reminds me, of course, as everyone thinks of an accurate census, "how will that affect me?" It reminds me of Hemingway's "For Whom the Bell Tolls." And I will tell my colleagues now, if we do not realize an accurate census, that bell tolls for them, for me, our children, our constituents, and their children.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FILNER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

- Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mrs. CAPPs, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. FALCOMA, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. RUSH, for 5 minutes, today.
- Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. MCGOVERN, for 5 minutes, today.
- Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

- Mr. HOLT, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. STUPAK, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. TOWNS, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mrs. MEEK of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DIAZ-BALART) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

- Mr. HERGER, for 5 minutes, on May 13.
- Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, on May 19.
- Mr. HANSEN, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

- Mr. HILL of Montana, for 5 minutes, on May 18.
 - Mrs. MORELLA, for 5 minutes, today.
- (The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

- Mr. CASTLE, for 5 minutes, today.
- (The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

- Mr. INSLEE, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn. The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 13, 1999, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2049. A letter from the Administrator, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Dairy Market Loss Assistance Program (RIN: 0560-AF67) received May 5, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2050. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department Of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Dried Prunes Produced in California: Undersized Regulation for the 1999-2000 Crop Year [Docket No. FV99-993-2 FR] received May 5, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2051. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department Of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Melons Grown in South Texas; Change in Container Regulation [Docket No. FV99-979-1 IFR] received May 5, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2052. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office Of The United States Courts, transmitting a proposed emergency supplemental request for fiscal year 1999 to provide for a necessary level of security for judges,