

that builds on Medicare's strengths and ensures its solvency for decades ahead.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATKINS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WATKINS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

Mrs. KELLY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. DELAURO addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mrs. NAPOLITANO addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### 2000 CENSUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues only have to look at the history of the issue of the census to understand what is going on in the House this Congress. Tomorrow, we will begin the debate on the supplemental appropriations bill for the Wye River Peace Accord and the victims of Hurricane Mitch.

Just 2 years ago, we were debating another supplemental appropriations bill. Then it was for flood victims in the Midwest. The waters in North Dakota had not yet receded when the Republican majority added language to ban the use of modern scientific methods to the flood relief bill. They thought the President would not dare veto flood relief over the census, particularly when so many people were suffering. They were wrong.

The President vetoed the bill, stating very strongly that Congress had no

business tying flood relief to anti-modern scientific counts in the census. The President received editorial support clear across this Nation, and the Republican majority backed down.

Then, in September of 1997, the majority put language in the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill to ban the use of modern scientific methods. When the President threatened to veto that, the majority knew they did not dare shut down the government over the census, so they came to the bargaining table with 17 pages of language designed to tie the Census Bureau up in knots.

The majority insisted on language that required two sets of numbers for the 2000 census. Now they say that two sets of numbers is irresponsible. They set up a monitoring board with a \$4 million budget and complained when the President insisted that the board be balanced with an equal number of presidential appointments and congressional appointments.

The majority tried again in 1998 to kill the use of modern scientific methods and failed. Then they turned to the courts. In January they lost that battle, too. The Supreme Court ruled that the Census Bureau could not use modern scientific methods for apportionment, but they are required to use it for everything else, if feasible. Of course, what the majority really cared about was keeping the Census Bureau from producing census counts that were corrected for those missed and counted twice.

Now they are desperate again. They claim that apportioning the 435 seats among the States is the same thing as drawing Congressional District boundaries, even though apportionment is done by the Congress and drawing district lines is done by the State legislatures. In fact, the last time the Republicans controlled Congress during the census was 1920, and they so disliked the results of that census that they refused to reapportion the House for the entire decade.

The fight today is about whether or not the professionals at the Census Bureau will be allowed to conduct the census as they see fit. The majority has introduced seven bills that look harmless on the surface but most of them are designed to make it more difficult for the professionals to do an accurate count.

Several of the bills are so invasive that the Census Bureau director said that the effect, and I am quoting Dr. Prewitt now, the Director of the Census Bureau, he claimed it would be "just short of disastrous." He said, "It would put the entire census at risk".

Several are so bad that the Secretary of Commerce said that he would recommend a presidential veto. None of their proposals would make the census any more accurate. And I will insert at this point in the RECORD the letter from Secretary of Commerce Daley to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,  
Washington, DC, March 16, 1999.

Hon. DAN BURTON,  
Chairman, Committee on Government Reform,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BURTON: Tomorrow, the Government Reform Committee is scheduled to mark up seven bills related to the conduct of the Decennial Census in 2000. While I know we share a common goal of ensuring that Census 2000 is the most accurate and cost-effective Decennial possible, the Department of Commerce must strongly oppose legislation that would mandate a post census local review, require the printing of short census forms in 34 languages, and mandate a second mailing of census forms.

According to the Director of the Census Bureau, Kenneth Prewitt, and the professionals at the Census Bureau, these three bills would reduce the accuracy and seriously disrupt the schedule of Census 2000. Based on the attached detailed analysis of the legislation provided by Dr. Prewitt, if this legislation were presented to the President, I would recommend that he veto it.

The Census Bureau is already working on many of the issues that these and the other four bills address. For example, the Census Bureau is not designed to manage a grant program, but it is working to increase partnerships with local governments and tribal and non-profit organizations to increase participation in Census 2000. In addition, we expect to seek additional funding for a variety of other activities. And we would appreciate assistance in making it possible for more individuals to take temporary census jobs without losing their government benefits.

Thank you for this opportunity to present our views on the legislation under consideration by your Committee. I look forward to continuing to work with you and other members of Congress to ensure that Census 2000 is the most accurate census possible.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. DALEY.

Mr. Speaker, the 1990 census was the first census to be less accurate than the one before it. There were 8.4 million people missed and 4.4 million people were counted twice. The 1990 census missed 1 in 10 African American males, 1 in 20 Latinos, 1 in 8 American Indians on reservations, and 1 in 16 rural non-Hispanic whites. The sole focus of the majority's agenda is to make sure that these people are left out of the next census as well.

When the Constitution was written, there was a shameful compromise to the count. African Americans were counted as three-fifths of a person. We must not allow the 2000 census to count African American males as nine-tenths of a person.

There is one clear and simple issue here. Will the next census count everyone or will it repeat the mistakes of 1990, leaving millions of people unrepresented and unfairly left out?

The census is tied to not only accurate data but our funding formulas are tied to it. The census plan that the Census Bureau has put forward, using modern scientific counts, is supported by the entire scientific community.

These are the people that support statistical methods in the Census 2000: The National Academy of Sciences; the American Statistical Association; the Council of Professional Associates on Federal Statistics. Dr. Barbara