

not have a radical, impractical idea of how we should conduct the census. Common sense says we simply need to count everybody. The majority of Members simply want the Bureau to use the basic method we have always used in this country. We want to make some common sense improvements and spend enough money to make sure we count all Americans, but we are not trying to push an unprecedented, untested method on the Bureau, nor are we advocating an approach that will not work.

In fact, it is the administration that has the unprecedented and highly complex idea of how to conduct the census. They have unilaterally decided to abandon the method we have used in this country for 200 years because they have a new academic theory. If the Clinton administration believes they have a better method, they should present the plan to Congress and get our approval, but the simple fact that they want to try an untested, unprecedented method, the burden of proof is on them. The burden of receiving explicit congressional approval is on them. The burden of convincing the American people to pay for this extravagant experiment is on them.

The House has wisely formed a subcommittee to conduct oversight on the census, and I am honored to serve as its chairman and we will have a very successful committee. I believe the Census Bureau wants to work with us, but at the moment they do not have a leader. Martha Riche, the Director for the past several years, left office last week. This is a difficult time to lose a census director. The Commerce Inspector General and the General Accounting Office have made clear that the census is not in great shape at this moment. In a few months, they will be conducting some important dress rehearsals in Sacramento, California, and Charleston, South Carolina and in South Dakota. Simultaneously, they must continue ramping up for the 2000 census. The Bureau is in dire need of leadership and organization, and they need a director as soon as possible.

I want to make my position clear about the qualifications needed for the next census director. First, Mr. President, do not play political games with the legitimacy of the House of Representatives. Do not send up a political spokesperson who is not committed to faithfully carrying out the intent of the law. I have said I have no litmus test, but, Mr. President, you better not have a litmus test either. Your nominee must be prepared to plan and carry out a full enumeration, because that is the will of the majority of this Congress.

Article I of our Constitution requires Congress to conduct the decennial census to apportion Representatives among the States. We take it very seriously. I believe, therefore, that it would be wise to consult the House extensively before we nominate a new census director. We cannot risk the

people's confidence in the 2000 census. The next census director must not be a political lightning rod for untried ideology. In no measure a successful census is defined by the people's confidence and its fairness and accuracy. The majority of the Representatives and Senators oppose the administration's new untested methodology of how to conduct the 2000 census. It would be a tragic mistake to put forward a nominee who the congressional majority views as unwilling to work with us.

□ 1845

Over the next several months, our subcommittee plans to hold a series of hearings to learn more about the status of the planning for the census. We intend to examine the design flaws in the Bureau's complicated plans. We will make sure that the Bureau moves forward with planning for a new numeration as the recent legislation signed by the President requires.

I hope to offer constructive and practical ideas of how we can improve on past censuses without risking a failed census. I do not believe in throwing out the baby with the bath water. We have a great deal of work to do to save the census. Let us get started.

AGREEMENT BETWEEN GOVERNMENTS OF UNITED STATES AND LATVIA CONCERNING FISHERIES OFF THE COAST OF THE UNITED STATES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGAN) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Resources and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.), I transmit herewith an Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Latvia extending the Agreement of April 8, 1993, Concerning Fisheries Off the Coasts of the United States, with annex, as extended (the 1993 Agreement). The present Agreement, which was effected by an exchange of notes at Riga on February 13 and May 23, 1997, extends the 1993 Agreement to December 31, 1999.

In light of the importance of our fisheries relationship with the Republic of Latvia, I urge that the Congress give favorable consideration to this Agreement at an early date.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 3, 1998.

ANNUAL REPORT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD, FISCAL YEAR 1996—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Ways and Means: *To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith the Annual Report of the Railroad Retirement Board for Fiscal Year 1996, pursuant to the provisions of section 7(b)(6) of the Railroad Retirement Act and section 12(l) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 3, 1998.

DISAPPOINTMENT WITH THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET SUBMISSION

(Mr. MILLER of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today the Committee on the Budget began the process of reviewing the 1999 budget submission of the President. It was very disappointing for a Member who is a very fiscally conservative Member to see a proposal that has more smoke and mirrors of how to spend more money.

We had a budget agreement that we agreed to last year, and I had the pleasure of being at the South Lawn of the White House when the President signed that document in August. Less than 6 months later, we have \$150 billion more in spending. I know they have a lot of neat little gimmicks of how to disguise the spending, but the bottom line is it is not in the spirit of the budget agreement that was signed last year and in the reconciliation bill that was signed into law by the President. That was not the intent of the agreement that we worked on last year.

For those of us who went along with that agreement, knowing that we would have to have tight spending controls this coming year, we feel very, very disappointed; and I feel it is not right to try to get us to move ahead with more spending programs at this time.

One of the ways to justify it is this tobacco settlement. I am not a pro-tobacco Congressman. I would be classified as an anti-tobacco Congressman. But the point is, we should not begin spending money until we have it in our hands.

We do not know what kind of agreement will be reached. The administration claims they are going to send one up in a few weeks, but we do not have a plan before us right now. So how are we going to have this money and why are we spending it before we have it in