percent will not be counted by mail or phone. At $25 million for each 1 percent, that's $875 million to follow up with nonresponding households. And even after hiring a half a million temporary employees, and spending weeks going door to door, not everyone will be counted. No census has ever counted everyone. The difference is that we now have the technology and scientific tools to estimate how many people were missed, and to correct the census so that it is as inclusive as possible.

The 1990 census missed almost 2 percent of the population. If that were spread evenly across groups of people and across the country, not too many stakeholders would care. But the undercount is not random. Less than 1 percent of whites were missed, but over 5 percent of African-Americans were missed. On Indian reservation the census missed 12 percent.

In 1990 the census included an experimental method to correct these mistakes—to account for those who are missed and to correct for those who are counted twice. In the end, the Secretary of Commerce chose not to use those adjustments, and we have lived with those inequities for the past 7 years. Every year millions of dollars are lost by States whose population was undercounted.

The vast body of scientific evidence shows that these errors can be corrected in a way that is fair to all. Three separate panels of experts at the National Academy of Sciences have recommended that these errors be corrected. The techniques for correcting the census have been endorsed by professional organizations like the American Statistical Association and by groups like the National Association of Counties. The inspector general at the Commerce Department has endorsed correcting these errors, as has the General Accounting Office.

Well, you must be asking yourself by now, just who opposes a more accurate census. Unfortunately, some Members of this body will pay any price to get the wrong answer. They argue that we should throw more money at the old methods of doing the census, even though they will produce a count that is less accurate. Of course, the Members making this argument are not on the Appropriations Committee. The members of the Appropriations Committee have yet to fund the census at the requested level, much less, give the Census Bureau more money.

One of the objections they raise to the methods proposed for the 2000 census is that they are not allowed under current law. I disagree with their interpretation of the law. This bill makes it clear that once the Census Bureau makes a good faith effort at an enumeration, the count can be supplemented by other methods to achieve a more accurate count.

Mr. Speaker, we must all work for the most accurate census possible in 2000. If we do not, it will be the American public who loses. My bill will make a more accurate census possible, and ensure that any confusion over current law is eliminated. I urge that it be passed quickly.