close attention to and, hopefully, support. This is H. Con. Res. 227. It is a concurrent resolution directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove United States Armed Forces from the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The troops should never have been sent there in the first place. There was a lot of controversy. It was far from unanimous consent from the Congress to send the troops there. They were sent there in 1995, and they were to be there for 18 months, and each time we came upon a date for removing the troops, they were extended.

Currently, it is the President's position that the troops will stay indefinitely. He has not set a date, although the Congress has set a date for this June for all funding to be removed as of June and the troops should come home. This resolution more or less states that same position. I strongly favor this, and I believe that the Congress should send a strong message that we should not casually and carelessly send troops around the world to police the world. This is a good way for us to get into trouble.

Our national security is not threatened. There was no justification for our troops to be sent there. There are always good reasons, though, given because there are problems. Well, there are problems every place in the world. If we try to solve all the problems of the world, we would not have troops in a hundred countries like we have now, we would have them in three or four hundred countries. But it is true that we send troops with the most amount of pressure put upon us to do it.

There are certain countries, like in Rwanda, Africa, we certainly did not apply the same rules to that country as we do to Bosnia and the Persian Gulf and Iraq. We did not do this when we saw the mass killings in the Far East under Pol Pot.

So, under certain circumstances where there is political pressure made by certain allies or by interests of oil, then we are likely to get involved. But the principle of a noninterventionism foreign policy should make certain that we, the Congress, never condone, never endorse, never promote the placement of troops around the world in harm's way because it is a good way for men to get killed and, for most purposes, the lives of our American soldiers are too valuable to be put into a situation where there is so much harm and danger.

Fortunately, there has been no American deaths in this region, but there is a good reason for those troops to come out. The peace has not been settled, though, there. It is not going to be. And our 16,000 or 20,000 troops that we have had there will not be able to maintain the peace as long as these warring factions exist. They have existed not for months, not for a few years, but literally for hundreds of years if not thousands of years people in this region have been fighting among themselves.

So it is not our responsibility. Yes, we can condemn the violence; and who would not? But does that justify the taxing of American citizens and imposing a threat to American lives by imposing and sending our troops to all these hot spots around the region?

So I strongly urge my fellow colleagues to look carefully at this resolution tomorrow and assume congressional responsibility. It is not the responsibility of the President to wage war, to put troops around the world. That is a congressional responsibility.

So although there has been no declaration of war, we are sitting ducks for a war to be started. So let us stop the war before it gets started.

I think we should strongly endorse this resolution and make sure these troops come home. It is interesting that there is a fair amount of support for this, and we obviously won the vote on this last year to say the troops should come home in June of this year. I suspect and hope that this will be restated, and there will be no excuse to extend their stay in this region.

But at the same time we win those kind of votes, and there is a strong sentiment here in the Congress when we are required to vote and there is certainly a strong sentiment among the American people that we ought to be dealing with our problems here at home, we ought not to assume the role of world policemen, and we ought to mind our own business, and we ought to be concerned about the sovereignty of the United States, rather than sending our troops around the world under the auspices of the United Nations and NATO and literally giving up our sovereignty to international bodies. We were very confused as to who was really in charge of foreign policy in Iraq, whether it was Kofi Annan or whether it was our President.

AGREEMENTS BETWEEN TELEVISION STATIONS AND POLICE

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, Tuesday, January 27, people in my hometown of Portland, Oregon, were stunned by a series of events that stem from a drug raid gone bad. In the midst of this episode, one Portland policewoman was killed, another seriously injured, and a third received more minor injuries.

Reflecting back on this episode, Mr. Speaker, there were two areas that gave great local concern.

One was an activity involved with the coverage, the live coverage of this event by local news helicopters on the raid and the concern on the part of some that this might have interfered with the police activities at that event, both in terms of providing interference, in terms of communication with the noise that was involved, the police direct communication, one with another, and the potential that it was possible for the gunman in this case to have used live television broadcasts to be able to monitor the events at the scene.

There was another area of great concern, and that was simply the firepower of this gunman. To say the least, it was disturbing that his private arsenal included a grenade launcher and numerous grenades, a crossbow with darts, a small arsenal of shotguns, rifles, handguns, hundreds of rounds of ammunition, including 100-round capacity magazine with 80 rounds inside.

That weapon actually used in the shooting was an SKS semiautomatic assault weapon. This weapon was powerful enough that the fatal bullet was fired through the front door, that it was possible that there were other bullets that went through the walls of the house and through both sides of police car parked outside.

The weapon in question was not on the 1994 Crime Control Bill of banned assault weapons, although that bill did prohibit the manufacture of ammunition and magazines of more than 10 rounds. However, high-capacity ammunition magazines manufactured prior to September of 1994 were exempted, with the expectation that the manufacturers would sell off the stockpiles within a few years.

Unfortunately, that 1994 ban allowed manufacturers to stockpile a seemingly unlimited supply of high-capacity ammunition magazines which are still being sold regularly today by manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers, 3 years after that ban went into effect.

This is noteworthy because, although assault weapons account for a tiny fraction of the guns in private hands, they were used in over 13 percent of the 122 fatal law enforcement shootings that took place in a 21-month period in 1994 and 1995. Of those deaths, almost 20 percent involved high-capacity magazines.

When faced with tragedy of this nature as we faced in Portland, it is important to reflect on what we learn from these circumstances. That is the true story today. The positive changes were a result of reflection on this episode.

I am pleased that the local authorities and the news media came together to deal with an area of friction in the past to establish a voluntary agreement to be used in emergency situations in the future. This agreement will ensure a safe environment for our police, while guaranteeing that the public has an access to information.

The stations will no longer show live shots of special emergency reaction teams. They will keep helicopters a mile away and at least 1,000 feet in elevation to prevent disturbance with emergency police communication.

The police will provide a location as close as possible to the emergency

event for a TV pool camera on the ground and to videotape the operation for later broadcast. The police in the communications activities with the stations have set up a special phone to give a direct link to the four local news stations.

This senseless killing served as a wake-up call for Portland. I think the model agreement that we have developed can serve as a model for other communities in the future.

I would ask my colleagues to reflect upon the situation that they may see in their community. Are there appropriate agreements in place between the news media and law enforcement in their hometowns?

It is clearly not Congress' role to have to legislate news coverage. It is, however, our role to do everything in our power to make sure that this never happens again. Congress does have a role in dealing with the trade, distribution of and availability of dangerous weapons; and I hope we will readdress this in the future.

I encourage my colleagues to learn from this Portland tragedy. To do so would mean that the sacrifice of Portland's finest will not have been in vain.

□ 1245

2000 CENSUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOBSON). 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, I rise today to talk about the 2000 Census. I realize there are not many people in Washington focused on that subject today or this week. While the country remains fixated on the problems engulfing the White House, the business of government must go on. The 2000 Census will be the largest peacetime mobilization ever undertaken by the Federal Government, and the planning must continue.

I want to begin by complimenting and thanking Acting Director James Holmes. Last week we were headed towards a confrontation over the issue of congressional access. Last night I received word from Mr. Holmes and we have resolved the issue. I think Mr. Holmes understands how seriously Congress takes its oversight responsibilities in regard to the census. Given all the controversy surrounding the methodology of the 2000 Census, the best way to proceed is to have an open relationship in the process of information gathering. Frankly, until Mr. Holmes arrived, the administration had a different view.

Mr. Speaker, we need cooperation between Congress and the administration because at the moment the 2000 Census is in serious trouble. I have said I believe we are headed towards a failed census. The Clinton administration, without the approval of the Congress, has designed the largest statistical experiment in U.S. history. The plan is multifaceted and complicated. If one element of the plan goes wrong, it can destroy the accuracy of the entire census. The plan depends on an unrealistic time line and if they do not meet the deadlines at each step, the plan could easily fall apart.

The Commerce Department's own Inspector General has called the plan risky. The Inspector General said in December, ''We conclude that although the 2000 Census design is risky, the bureau's fundamental problem is that it simply may not have enough time to plan and implement a design that achieves its dual goals of containing cost and increasing accuracy.'' The Inspector General goes on to state, ''Because this process is long, complex, and operating under a tight schedule, there will be many opportunities for operational and statistical errors.''

I have a Ph.D. in statistics and marketing, so I understand clearly the operational risk of this plan. As a statistician, the administration plan raises too many red flags to move forward and spend $4 billion of taxpayers' money.

Let me try and give my colleagues a basic outline of this grand experiment. There are 60,000 census tracks in the United States. Each contains about 4,000 people. Under this new, untested theory, the administration wants to count only 90 percent of the people in each census track. That is unprecedented. For the first time in American history we will not attempt to count all Americans. First, they collect all the census forms returned by mail for each of the 60,000 census tracks. They hope to average about 67 percent response rate in each track. Then in each of these 60,000 tracks, they will randomly remove enough remaining addresses to add up to 10 percent of the total census track and then put them aside. Then they will do what is called a nonresponse follow-up with the homes not removed so they have actually counted 90 percent of the people in each track. Then they will conduct 60,000 simultaneous polls to estimate the other 10 percent in each census track.

This has never been tried before. The scope of this experiment is simply breathtaking. When you see a poll in the New York Times or CNN or USA Today the pollsters typically do one poll and survey 1,000 or so Americans. I saw a poll this morning that shows the President's approval ratings just went up again, which really has to make one question the accuracy of polling. But what this administration is talking about doing is 60,000 separate simultaneous polls at the same time. It has never been tried before and the potential for mistakes and errors is quite large.

That is just the beginning. After all this has been completed, they will conduct an extensive nationwide poll of 750,000 American households. This is done to adjust the figures in all 60,000 census tracks. Some tracks will be added to, some subtracted from, based on this poll of 750,000 households. This 750,000 survey is called the Integrated Coverage Measurement or ICM. The administration claims the ICM will increase accuracy. That is a huge theoretical leap of faith. The Commerce Inspector General says, ''Because of its complexity, the ICM is highly vulnerable. In particular, the survey's magnitude, quality demands, and tight schedule all present serious challenges.'' He added, ''Estimation associated with the ICM survey in particular faces lingering methodological questions.'' In other words, it is not at all clear that the experiment will increase accuracy at all. We need to work together and get the most accurate, best census we can for the year 2000, not test or try experiments.

SALUTING UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND MEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. WEYGAND) is recognized during morning hour debates for 3 minutes.

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon with great pride, because the smallest State in the country, Rhode Island, has one of the greatest basketball teams in the country, the University of Rhode Island. It won its game just two days ago against one of the powerhouses of this country, the University of Kansas, in an outstanding game that pitted a very small, some people would say even very slow, untalented basketball team against one of the giants. A team like Kansas, that had two first-team all-Americans, was unbeatable by the critics' viewpoint. Rhode Island did not have a chance. As a matter of fact, most of them did not think they had a chance against a smaller team called Murray State. But Rhode Island proved them wrong. They proved their critics wrong. More importantly, what they brought to our small State was great pride.

I am here this morning because as an alum of the University of Rhode Island, my daughter also an alumnus and my son a freshman, we could not be more happy. All of the people in the State of Rhode Island, all 1 million people, are ecstatic about what has happened. We have proven that small schools are still alive and doing well in the NCAA. We have proven that no matter what the odds may be, no matter how big the task may be, no matter how big the obstacle, even a small team in a small State can overcome those. We are extremely proud of our university, of all the things that they have become, but more importantly of their future. We look forward to Friday evening's basketball game against Valparaiso, and we join with our colleagues over there to have a celebration on Saturday