

act of conquest and an American victory in war. The people of Guam, my people, really had very little to do with it.

The Treaty of Paris, signed between the United States and Spain, stipulates that the United States Congress is obligated to determine the civil rights and political status of Guam's native inhabitants. One hundred years has passed, and this obligation has not been entirely fulfilled. The people of Guam certainly have much to reflect upon, and I hope that we do not wait for another 100 years before this country brings the full meaning of democracy to an area first taken in the spirit of imperialism.

Mr. Speaker, I include the program of the conference I mentioned earlier.

The material referred to is as follows:

[The Richard Flores Taitano Micronesian Area Research Center, University of Guam, Presents]

THE LEGACY OF THE SPANISH AMERICAN WAR IN THE PACIFIC: A CENTENNIAL CONFERENCE—17, 18 AND 19 JUNE 1998

Inauguration: Hilton Hotel, Wednesday 17 June 1998, 6:15 p.m.-9:30 p.m. Panels: Hilton Hotel, Thursday 18 June 1998, 8:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m. Guided Tour to Historical Sites: Friday 19 June 1998, 8:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m. Conclusion: Hagana Cathedral-Basilica Friday 19 June 1998, 7:00 p.m.

Registration, Hilton Hotel, Wednesday 17 June 1998, 5:00 p.m., \$25.00.

Join this interdisciplinary conference, which offers the possibility for an exchange of ideas among local, national and international scholars. As an academic conference, it will increase discussion regarding the effects of 1898, not only on Guam, but on other areas of the Pacific.

This year, 1998, the centennial of the Spanish American War, provides an opportunity to reflect on the events that directly affected the people of Guam and the Pacific. It is important to consider those historical events that show the links of Guam with the Philippines and Spain in the past and with the United States today, while paying significant attention to the expectations of its people.

Featured Panelists:

Key Note Speaker, Congressman Robert Underwood.

Lourdes Diaz-Trechuclo, Ph.D., Universidad de Cordoba, Spain "Spanish Politics and the Mariana Islands."

Herman Hiery, Ph.D., University of Bayreuth, Germany "War with Germany is Imminent: Germany and the Philippines in the Spanish American War."

Thomas H. Neale, U.S. Library of Congress "Reluctant Imperialist? U.S. Congress and the War of 1898."

Wilfrido Vallacorta, Ph.D., De la Salle University, Philippines.

Logan Wagner, Ph.D., University of Texas "Architectural and Urban Design Legacy of Guam's Spanish Period."

Javier Galvn, Architect, School of Architecture, Madrid "The Preservation of the Architectural Legacy of Micronesia."

Jorge Loyzaga, Senior Architect, Mexico.

Dirk A. Ballendorf, Ed.D., University of Guam "The Americans, the Spanish-American War, and the Caroline Islands."

Prof. Augusto de Viana, University Ateneo de Manila "Apolinario Mabini and other Revolutionaries exiled in Guam by the Americans."

Florentino Rodao, Ph.D., Universidad Complutense, Madrid "Monsignor Olano, Bishop of Guam."

Arnold M. Leibowitz, Esq., Washington, D.C. "The Concept of Commonwealth and Freely Associate States."

Most Rev. Anthony Apuron, O.F.M. Cap, D.D. "The Role of the Church in the Preservation of the Chamorro Language."

Rafael Rodriguez-Ponga, Ph.D., Director General of International Cooperation of the Ministry of Education and Culture of Spain. "The Spanish Influence in the Chamorro Language."

Laura T. Sauder, Ph.D., CEO, Betances & Associates, Chicago "Enduring Legacies: A Catholic Socio-religious Identity, An American Socio-political Identity."

Antonio Garcia-Abasolo, Ph.D., Universidad de Cordoba, Spain "Spanish Migration and Population to the Philippines."

Ann Hattori, Ph.D., candidate, University of Hawaii at Manoa "Feminine Hygiene: Gender and Health Under the U.S. Naval Government of Guam, 1898-1941."

Robert E. Statham, Ph.D., University of Guam "The U.S. Commonwealth of Puerto Rico: Pragmatism and the Empty Promise of Confederal Autonomy in the American Federal Republic."

Michael Phillips, Esq., Guam "Give 'em an inch; they take a yard. Grant 'em an easement; they take it all."

Donald Platt, Ph.D., University of Guam "Humanitarianism, Imperialism, or what? Demythologizing the United States' Reasons for going to War with Spain in 1898."

Robert F. Rogers, Ph.D., University of Guam (R) "From Spanish Lake to America Lake: The Enduring Geopolitical Legacy of the Spanish American War."

For more information contact RFT MARC 735-2150 or Professor Omaira Brunal-Perry, Chairperson Organizing Committee 735-2157.

This program is supported by The University of Guam, The Richard Flores Taitano Micronesian Area Research Center, the Director General of International Cooperation of the Ministry of Education and Culture of Spain, the Guam Preservation Trust, the Guam Visitors Bureau, the U.S. Department of Interior, the Office of Delegate Robert Underwood, Title VI NRC/FLAGS Grant Project, the 24th Guam Legislature and the Centennial Task Force.

THE 2000 CENSUS: POLLING VERSUS AN ACTUAL COUNT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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, we are less than 2 years from the beginning of the decennial census. The decennial census is a requirement of our Constitution where we count everybody living in America every 10 years. Since 1970 we have been doing it, and we are gearing up now for the 2000 census. It is one of the most important and controversial issues faced in public policy today.

It is controversial because, for the first time in history, the Clinton administration has proposed a radically different approach to be conducting the census. They have proposed this radical change without the approval of Congress. For the first time in history since 1790, for the first time, they do not want to count everybody. They only want to count some of the people and guess at the rest of them. They want to use science to come up with es-

timates of a population, rather than actually counting people, the hard work of Jefferson and Washington, we have been counting the population. Now they have come up with this radical idea.

It is a very important issue because it is fundamental to our democratic system of government, because most elected officials in this country are dependent upon an accurate census, and hundreds of billions of dollars flow out of Washington and out of State capitals on the census, so it is a critical issue.

The problem we are facing is we are moving towards a failed census. The General Accounting Office, who is the independent auditor of the Federal Government, has reported time and again that we are moving towards a failed census. The Inspector General for the Commerce Department has also warned us. So we have a serious problem.

Last week the President flew to Houston, mainly to raise money, but also to talk about the census. I am glad the President has entered this debate personally. His arguments in Houston were exactly why we should not use his plan.

What the President talked about was polling versus sampling. Polling is something we are all very familiar with. It is used in politics and actually in business and for a wide variety of areas. What the President was saying, and there is an interesting analogy, is that polling, and let me quote the President, "Most people understand that a poll taken before an election is a statistical sample. Sometimes it is wrong, but more often than not, it is right." That is what the President said. "Sometimes it is wrong, but more often than not, it is right."

Well, let us look at what really happens with polling. We will see the problems with it and why it is so dangerous and risky to try to use polling on the upcoming decennial census. One of the best ways to evaluate whether a poll is accurate is looking at election results. Let us look back at the last Presidential election in 1996, less than 2 short years ago.

Right before the election in November, all the major polls came up with the results that weekend before the Tuesday election. As we all know, President Clinton won and beat Bob Dole by 8 percentage points. That is a factor, what do you win by, and what is the difference between the winner and loser. Bill Clinton won and got 8.4 percent higher votes, percentage points, than Bob Dole.

CBS/New York Times, on the weekend before the election, the polling said the victory is going to be 18 points, not 8 percent, 18 percentage points. ABC said 12 percentage points. The Harris poll said 12 percentage. The Wall Street Journal/NBC, said it was going to be a 12-point election. CNN/USA Today, conducted by the Gallup poll, said a 13-

point spread, not 8 points. That was a 50 percent mistake.

How can we rely on polling? We cannot just say it is close enough for government work. We are going to spend \$4 billion on a poll that is not going to be close, if it is based on the polling ideas, the President wants us to risk that, and especially since it is something that is so important and that is fundamental to our democratic system. It is just wrong.

The President did not mention that back in 1990 we attempted to use sampling. It failed in 1990. When they tried to use sampling to adjust the population enumeration, it was a failure. It was a failure because it would have, for example, taken a congressional seat away from Pennsylvania and given it away without justification, because it turned out 2 years later it was a computer error and never should have been recommended.

It also says that adjusting, based on sampling, is less accurate when you have populations of less than 100,000 people. I am sure big-city mayors may like this, but we have to work with census tracts, we have to work with smaller communities. How do we show this is going to be trustworthy?

There is another thing I was concerned about in President Clinton's comments. I do not think President Clinton means to divide America. He said that Texas would have gained \$1 billion if we had used sampling. We are talking about a zero sum game. A zero sum game means if you give \$1 billion to Texas, you are going to take away \$1 billion from somewhere else. We only have a fixed amount of money when we get to block grants. When we take money from one area to another area, we had better explain to people why we are taking the money away.

For example, when we start adjusting the census and subtracting people from the population, which they tried to do in 1990, that is when we start making people upset and not trusting our system. We cannot use this. This is not close enough for government work. It is wrong. We need to do an actual enumeration.

E-RATE/TRUTH IN BILLING

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, over the course of recent months, I have taken to this floor in support of one of the critical elements of the 1996 Telecommunication Act, which was an agreement that was forged between Congress and the telecommunications industry for the benefit of our schools and libraries.

It was decreed that the concept of universal service, which has been employed since 1934 to subsidize the cost of extending service to rural areas,

areas that provide very high costs, would be extended to include the Internet access for our schools and libraries through a mechanism known as the E-Rate.

It was determined that the E-Rate would be paid for by the savings that would be received by the telecommunication industry as a result of deregulation.

Over the course of this last year and a half, 30,000 schools and libraries across America are seeking to capitalize on this provision in the agreement. They have put tens of thousands of dollars into developing technology plans and applying for the discounts on services they need to give America's school kids access to the information highway. This is an important opportunity to remedy the fact that barely a quarter of America's classrooms have Internet access today.

Through a mechanism that would provide discounts ranging from 20 to 80 percent based on the cost of providing service and the poverty level in the individual community, this access would be provided.

Of late we have seen a certain amount of controversy arise surrounding the FCC and its handling of the new E-Rate authority. I will be the first to admit that there are a host of management and universal service issues. There are concerns, perhaps, about the mechanism chosen by the previous FCC Chair to pursue application approval.

□ 1245

But as evidenced by the recent surcharges that have been imposed by some of the giant telecommunications companies, and the people's reaction to them, there is also some controversy over whether adequate savings have materialized to cover the E-Rate costs or whether phone companies are seeking to recoup costs they have already recovered under deregulation.

I have received and examined information from the FCC that suggests that there are already over \$2 billion worth of savings that have been granted to the telecommunications industry with hundreds of millions of dollars more underway; more than enough to offset the proposed \$2 billion that is currently in the pipeline of applications from our schools and libraries.

But my concern, Mr. Speaker, is that we cannot let these controversies derail the promise of Internet and the benefits for schools that were approved under the act in 1996.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today that would call for a General Accounting Office study on the actual savings and give consumers some truth in billing. It would show how much money has been saved by the telecommunication carriers as a result of these hundreds of millions of dollars in reduction. It would show how much has been passed back through to the consumers, and how much additional cost telecommunication carriers will

have to bear, if any, in the implementation of the E-Rate.

In addition, my legislation would require that for those companies that seek to add additional line items to their bills, that these line items reflect the full and the accurate picture of both savings and costs to the carriers as a result of the Federal regulatory actions.

Similar language has already passed in the United States Senate, a part of their antislamming legislation, by a vote of 99-to-nothing.

The complex arguments surrounding implementation of a complex bill are hard for everybody to follow, but it will be lost on the thousands of representatives of our communities who are now operating in good faith to take advantage of what they understood to be a promise to help our schools and libraries.

We cannot end up holding our kids hostage to an intergovernmental dispute. This Congress will end up doing very little for education, the number one priority for most Americans. We must ensure that America's school kids have access to the information resources they need.

NATIONAL MEN'S HEALTH WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BALLENGER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from Florida and had my usual town hall meeting where we have a chance to discuss issues of the day with our constituents, and one of the things I find myself frequently talking about is health care, the cost of health care, the spiraling cost of health care and its impact on the human spirit and the human condition.

Regrettably, in society, we are spending a lot of time finding ways to spend money after disease onsets the human body. We talk about prostate cancer after the fact rather than PSA tests that could quickly arrest prostate cancer in the early beginning.

I found myself this morning reading a magazine on my flight from Florida, Men's Health, and I see a new nationwide survey reveals that men are not only avoiding important health checks, they are significantly behind women in the awareness of the importance of preventive health care. A nationwide survey conducted for Men's Health Magazine and CNN by Opinion Research Corporation finds that 1 in 10 or approximately 7 million men have avoided getting regular health exams for more than a decade. Over all, slightly more than 15 million men have not had a basic health check in over 15 years.

Let us talk about some of the statistics affecting men's health. An estimated 184,500 new cases of prostate cancer will be diagnosed in 1998. At least an estimated 2.5 million men, or