

We can use the "old" methods, or we can use the modern methods recommended by the Census Bureau. We can have an inaccurate census using the "old" method, or we can have a more accurate census using updated techniques for counting, recommended by the Census Bureau.

The 1990 census failed America's minority communities. Almost 9 million people were not counted in the process, including one in ten African-American males, one in twenty Hispanics and one in ten young Asian males. To make matters worse, there were 26 million errors in the census with 14.5 million people counted twice and another 13 million people counted in the wrong place. In fact the 1990 census was the first census in 200 years to be less accurate than the census preceding it.

This approach is unacceptable. Why would we retrace our steps down a failed path AGAIN? We owe it to all segments or our communities to make the strong effort to keep the census fair, accurate and representative of our diverse population.

In California, the statistics were alarming and had far-ranging consequences. 2.7% of the people living in California were missed in the 1990 count. There is much at stake in this process for California and its communities—to be counted, to be represented and to reap the federal benefits intended to spring from the best possible census numbers. In San Francisco alone, African Americans were undercounted by 13% and Hispanics by 16%.

The 1990 census showed that 27 states and the District of Columbia lost \$4.5 billion over the decade in federal funds due to the failure to correct the 1990 census. California was the state most harmed by these inaccuracies. Our state would have received \$2.2 billion more in federal funds during this period—\$2,660 for each person missed.

The Republican majority has proposed a \$400 million ad campaign to highlight the census. Why spend almost half a billion dollars and do nothing to correct the inaccuracies of the past. Under this plan, we will get even less for our money than ever before. What kind of goal is that?

If there is a move to restrict the Census Bureau in its plans and the process is thwarted, we could be faced with a partial government shutdown with funding cut off for the departments of Commerce, Justice and State under the June 15 deadline. This crisis is avoidable and should be entirely unnecessary under the Supreme Court decision.

The Supreme Court decision supports the current efforts of the Census Bureau—to use the "old" method for the purposes of state apportionment in Congress under the law and to use methods recommended by the census experts to use improved counting to redistrict within each state and to distribute federal funds. This is a fair compromise. The Supreme Court agrees.

The Census Bureau is committed to producing the most accurate numbers possible for all uses other than for apportionment, and the Republican majority wants to prevent it from doing its job.

The rich ethnic diversity of our urban and rural areas should not be under-reported, underrepresented and under-funded under a failed system. We must have a more fair process for counting our nation's minority communities under a process that brings the greatest number of people into the headcount.

Yes, the Census counts. Every American should be concerned about a fair count and support the work of the experts at the Census Bureau in giving them the tools they require to do the best job for the best money. The American people deserve the best.

THE RADICAL LEFT, THE PRESIDENT'S COUNSEL AND THE DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS DO NOT LIKE THE CONSTITUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I certainly have been intrigued by the speech that we have been hearing about the census and about how we have heard words like "partisan motives" and "tactics" and basically the same things that we have been hearing for years, that Democrats have been attacking Republicans for back room maneuvers and saying all these horrible things because we do not want people to be represented according to them. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, the one thing though that I find really intriguing about this debate is that while Republicans are being attacked for this, the one thing that we do not hear about when it comes to reapportionment and when it comes to using the census to count voters in 2000 is the fact that this decision has already been reached, not in a back room in Congress, not by mean-spirited Republicans getting together and figuring out how they can harm human beings, but now it has been decided already across the street by the United States Supreme Court who ruled not long ago, just a month or two ago, that it is unconstitutional. It is unconstitutional to run a census the way the administration and the way that the radical left wants to run the census in 2000.

Mr. Speaker, I say "radical left." Why do I say "radical"? I say "radical," and my definition of "radical" is somebody or a group of legislators who want to radically break with the past, and that is what this is all about. As my colleagues know, they can talk about scientific means of measurement, they can talk about fairness, they can talk about whatever they want to talk about, but when they turn and point and blame the Republicans for the census in 2000, they are avoiding some very basic facts.

Mr. Speaker, the main fact they are avoiding is, and there are two facts actually; first fact is the United States Supreme Court says it is unconstitutional to guess how many Americans should be able to vote in an election. It is unconstitutional. The second fact that they conveniently avoid so they can come down here and make mean-spirited, radical assertions that just are not based on fact is that the United States Constitution itself, the framework for this great constitutional re-

public, says itself that you have got to count each person when we decide about reapportionment.

Now what did we hear? As my colleagues know, I do not know why we did not hear that other than it does not really play into their strong point as well as criticizing Republicans, attacking us as mean-spirited. Listen. The Republicans on this issue are irrelevant. If they have a problem, they need to take it up with the United States Supreme Court. They need to take it up with Madison and Hamilton and those people that drafted the United States Constitution over 200 years ago.

Now maybe they do not like the Constitution, maybe they think that this part of the Constitution is not suited well for the 21st century, maybe they want a radical departure from our history, maybe they want to take an extremist approach because they think they can pick up four or five seats. But I can tell my colleagues the Supreme Court, the United States Constitution and 222 years of American history does not support their argument.

Facts are stubborn things. Facts, not name calling, not mean-spirited attacks; facts are stubborn things.

It reminds me during the impeachment hearings and even before the impeachment hearings, as we led up to the impeachment hearings. Mr. Speaker, I remember Ken Starr being castigated time and time again. He is a renegade. Ken Starr is dangerous. He is trying to do things that he should not be able to do. That is what we heard from the radical left. But facts are stubborn things.

The President's attorneys, the radical left, the Democratic Caucus, all would attack Ken Starr and say he was doing things that would destroy the Presidency and the Constitution, and yet every time the legal question was taken to the United States Supreme Court, the United States Supreme Court, the highest court in the land, would come back and defend Ken Starr's right to conduct his legal investigation.

Now whether colleagues agreed with Mr. Starr's investigation or not, do not say that he is an out-of-control prosecutor that is trying to violate the law because the highest court in the land, the court sanctioned by the United States Constitution 222 years ago, said that what Mr. Starr was asking for was constitutionally correct.

□ 1500

Now, again, maybe the radical left, the President's counsel, and the entire Democratic Caucus does not like the Constitution. Maybe they are offended by 222 years of history. But do not attack the person that is living by the law and the Constitution, because facts are stubborn things.

This is something I have seen now for 4 years. Mr. Speaker, it was about 4½, 5 years ago that I was an American that sat on my couch and watched the news, watched C-Span, had never been

involved in politics. I decided that I should get off the couch, come to Washington, and try to make a change.

I did that. I have to tell the Members, I was shocked, absolutely shocked by some of the mean-spirited things that were said from the left to the right. Any time they disagreed on principle, they would attack personally.

I just do not know how many times I have heard somebody from the radical left call an opponent a Nazi because they disagreed with them politically; a Nazi, a member of an organization that killed 6 million Jews.

Just because you disagree with the way somebody votes on a school lunch program, whether someone wants it administered by the State, the local school agency or the Federal Government, does not mean that we should resort to this mean-spirited radical approach.

It is just like social security. I do not know how many times I have heard people on the left talk about Social Security and talk about how Republicans want to destroy Social Security. We have heard it from the administration time and time again. It is almost like they are a one-trick pony. That is all they know how to do is to scare people.

Once again, facts are stubborn things. It was just this week that CBO Director Crippen criticized the President and the administration, and for doing what? For planning to raid the Social Security trust fund by \$270 billion, steal \$270 billion from Social Security. Even in Washington, D.C., even among the radical left, \$270 billion is a lot of money.

The idea was let us go ahead and raid Social Security for \$270 billion, take it from Social Security, put it in the general account, and then, after we steal \$270 billion from this Federal program that was set up on a promise, then we spend that \$270 billion on new Federal programs, new bureaucracies, making new promises that this government will not keep.

We have to say, once and for all, to this administration and to those on the left that want to raid the Social Security trust fund to create new bureaucracies and new jobs and new power in Washington, D.C., keep your hands off Social Security. Keep your hands off Social Security.

There is a Republican plan by the gentleman from California (Mr. WALLY HERGER) that would allow us to, finally, after all of these years, keep politicians' hands off of Social Security. This plan would set aside the Social Security trust fund and stop politicians from raiding that trust fund.

The President would not be able to steal \$270 billion from the Social Security trust fund. Members of the radical left would not be able to create new Federal jobs, create new Federal bureaucracies, and create new Federal regulations with their ill-gotten dollars. Instead, we would set aside Social Security. We would keep it solvent, not only for my parents but for all of

Americans. We have got to do that. We have got to stop looting the Social Security trust fund.

Ironically, this is something that, back in 1995, when I came here with a group of 73 other freshmen Republicans, we actually put out a bill that Mark Neumann helped draft that would set aside the Social Security trust fund and protect Social Security's funds for our seniors. We were told at the time it was radical, that nobody would do it; that, listen, we have to go ahead and count the Social Security trust fund and raid it or there is no way we can balance the budget. The administration's budgets looted Social Security.

Right now, though, I think we are getting to a point where most conservative and moderate Members of Congress agree that we have got to keep Social Security safe and keep it off-budget, so our grandparents and our parents will be able to get back the money that they put in.

Is it a plan that will work? I do not know, but I would like the administration, I would like members of the radical left, I would like everybody to come to the table and at least talk about it, instead of saying let us raid Social Security by \$270 billion, and then turning around and saying, we are the ones that are protecting Social Security.

They cannot have it both ways. Either they are for protecting Social Security and keeping their hands off the Social Security trust fund, or they want to raid Social Security to the tune of \$270 billion, like the administration, to create bigger Federal bureaucracies. They cannot have it both ways. Facts are stubborn things.

Why are we in a position now that we can set aside the Social Security trust fund? It is because when we came here in 1995 we were not only concerned about senior citizens, we were concerned about our children, we were concerned about teenagers, we were concerned about people in their 20s, 30s, and 40s, and people who would be on Social Security down the road.

The only way we could take care of our future leaders, the only way we could allow them to enjoy the American dream that so many Americans have enjoyed in this great American century, was to stop raiding Social Security and stop stealing from our next generation.

When we got here, the deficit was \$300 billion, \$300 billion. The debt was \$5 trillion. What does that mean? It is hard to figure out exactly how much money that is. All I can say is this. Senator BOB KERREY headed up a bipartisan task force on Social Security, and his Social Security task force back in 1994 concluded that if Social Security spending and if spending on our Federal budget continued at current rates, then people in their teens and twenties would be paying 89 percent of their paychecks, 89 percent of their paychecks just to pay off their Federal taxes.

I think what Senator KERREY did was a courageous thing. Senator Simpson, now retired, was also on that commission. It is a commission that came up with good conclusions regarding the solvency of Social Security.

What does that mean? I guess we have to boil this down basically as much as we can so people in their teens and twenties can understand.

Let us say you have a job at Wendy's and you make \$200; a part-time job, and you make \$200 every 2 weeks. If you have to pay 90 percent of your salary in Federal taxes, that means you will get \$20 at the end of the day and the Federal Government will get \$180. That simply is not the right thing to do, but that is what our children and our grandchildren face and what they faced if we did not dare to stand up to say no to more and more spending.

What do we hear now, 4 years later, just 4 years later? We have gotten to a point where we could not only erase the deficit but also erase the \$5.4 trillion debt, just in 10 or 15 years. How did this come about? We hear an awful lot about the recovery. A lot of people want to take credit.

But I remember back in 1995 when we got here. We said, we are going to balance the budget and we are going to do it in 7 years or less. I actually voted on a plan that would balance the budget in 5 years. They called us radical and extreme because their views were radical and extreme.

I guess, to a political faction that had spent 40 years borrowing from their children and their grandchildren and stealing from their grandparents' Social Security trust fund, I guess our concept was radical.

This was our concept: If you spend \$1, then you had better bring in \$1. Stop borrowing from the next generation and from the generation that survived the Depression and won World War II. Instead, let us be fiscally responsible. So we brought out a plan to balance the budget. It was the plan of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHN KASICH). It was a courageous plan.

I got up here in my first couple of months in Washington and everybody in Washington told me, we cannot do it. This will never happen. We cannot balance the budget. In fact, I remember the President coming out and saying, if we tried to balance the budget in 7 years we would destroy the American economy. The President of the United States just 4 years ago said if we tried to balance the budget in 7 years we would destroy the United States economy.

We had some other people that knew a thing or two about economics come and testify before Congress. The gentleman from Ohio (Chairman KASICH) had Fed chairman Alan Greenspan come to Congress.

The chairman of the Fed said, if you people will only do what you say you want to do and pass a budget that will balance in 7 years, you will see unprecedented economic growth. You will see

interest rates rocket down. You will see unemployment go down. You will see the stock market explode. You will see America explode economically in a way that it had not exploded since the end of World War II.

Do Members know what? He was right. His prediction before the Committee on the Budget in early 1995 was deadly accurate. It is a good thing that we listened to our hearts, that we listened to the chairman of the Fed and ignored the naysayers on the radical left and ignored the President, who said, do not balance the budget; it is a very bad thing.

Facts are stubborn things. It was only 1 year later when he was running for president that he said his first priority would be to keep up the fight for balancing the budget. It is very interesting, because he vetoed nine appropriation bills, he shut down the government, all because he did not want to balance the budget in 7 years. He said it would destroy the economy.

What has our work accomplished? What has the work of the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman KASICH) accomplished? What has Speaker Gingrich, when he was still here as a Speaker, accomplished? What has the courage of Republicans and conservative Democrats alike accomplished?

Well, let us look at it. When we first got here 4 years ago the deficit was approaching \$300 billion. Now we are told that the budget will balance in the next year. When we first got here the Dow Jones was at 3,900. Today it is at 9,500, and middle class Americans have gotten involved in the market, in their 401(k) plans, and America is enjoying unprecedented economic growth.

Unemployment is down. Inflation has remained down. America has not enjoyed better times. Why? All because we ignored the naysayers and the people who said we cannot balance our checkbooks, we cannot run Washington the way middle-class Americans have to run their homes. We cannot do it.

We said, we can do it, Mr. President; and we will do it, Mr. President. And because we did, America enjoys unprecedented economic growth. It is time for us to step back, not to assess credit, not to assess blame, but just to say, let us remember the facts and let us remember what got us here. The gentleman from Ohio (Chairman KASICH) was for it. The Speaker was for it. Every Republican was for it. A few Democrats were for it. The President was against it, and the radical left was against it.

□ 1515

It is a good thing, a good thing that we stuck to our plan.

But yet, to hear the administration talk, one would think, my gosh, this was our plan all along. It was not. It just was not. And I suppose they can say it as much as they want to say it. They can take the credit as much as they want to take the credit. But facts are stubborn things.

So what we have to do in 1999 is remember the lessons of 1995, Mr. Speaker. Just because it is unpopular does not mean it is not the right thing to do. Just because less government may not be popular in Washington, D.C., does not mean it is not the right thing to do. Just because destroying the death tax, cutting capital gains tax, ending the marriage penalty and allowing people that make from \$45,000 to \$60,000 to pay less taxes, just because it may be tough does not mean it is not the right thing to do. It is the right thing to do.

It may seem radical to people whose entire life, their entire existence is based in Washington, D.C.; who believe that all roads lead to Washington; who believe that Washington knows how to spend out money better than we know how to spend our money; that believe Washington knows how to educate our children more than we know how to educate our children; that believe that Washington knows how to clean up crime better than communities know how to clean up crime. It may seem radical to them, but it does not seem radical to me. It did not seem radical to Ronald Reagan, and it certainly did not seem radical to Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. Speaker, we have to stop turning our backs on what made America so great. That is the individual. It is people.

"GOP" in the past has stood for Grand Old Party. I think that is a lousy name. I think that is a stupid, lousy name. What we ought to say is GOP stands for Government of the People.

Now, why do I say that? Because think about it. Who is the one, who is the party that is saying parents and teachers know more about educating children than the Federal Department of Education? Certainly not Democrats. They believe that the Federal bureaucracy in education should continue to grow, and the President has budgets to prove it.

Who believes Americans should keep more of their money and Washington should take less? It is not the Democrats of the radical left. In fact, the President of the United States went up to Buffalo a few weeks ago and made a statement that I am sure he wishes he could retract now. This is a statement that, unfortunately, reveals his heart when it comes to Washington, D.C. He said to this group about cutting taxes, he criticized Republicans because they actually wanted Americans to keep more of their money, and he said: You know, we in Washington could let you keep more of your money and hope you know how to spend it right. Oh, we cannot do that.

Hope? What is there to hope about? I mean, it is so painfully obvious that Americans know how to spend their money better than Washington, D.C. I will guarantee, Mr. Speaker, that if I went to the President of the United States today and I said, "Mr. President, I have got \$50 million for you,

and you can either have a bureaucrat in Washington, D.C., invest that money or you can invest that money yourself," I will guarantee that he will say, "I will invest it myself."

Let us say that someone won a \$50 million lottery across America and they said they want to give all of their money away to charity, they want to help people. If I gave them the option, would they rather give that \$50 million to Federal bureaucracies or would they rather give that \$50 million to private charities, I will guarantee that they would give it to private charities in a second because Washington, D.C., does not have all the answers. Washington, D.C., cannot do it as well as communities. All roads do not lead to Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, I still believe in the genius of America. I still believe in the genius of communities. And as the father of two boys in public schools, I still believe parents know how to raise their children and teach their children better than bureaucrats in the Federal Department of Education.

Maybe that is not in vogue in 1999. Maybe it is not in vogue to say that Americans are paying too much in taxes in 1999. Maybe the economy is doing so well that Americans want to give the Federal Government more money. Well, I hope not, because I do not think that is good for America and I do not think it is good for the Federal Government. Because if we give the Federal Government one dollar, they will figure out a way to need two dollars next year. If we give them two, they will need four. If we hire one employee this year, they will figure out a way that they will need to hire two next year.

We have got to get back to basics, not only in this Congress, not only in this country, but in this party. The party of Lincoln, the party of Madison and Jefferson, the party that believes that the genius of America lies in the heart of America and not in Washington, D.C.

So, hopefully, when we talk about Social Security, we can keep our word with the American people. We can stop stealing from Social Security. We can stop the President's plan dead in its track to loot the Social Security trust fund of \$270 billion. \$270 billion. We can stop the President's plan to spend more and more money. And, yes, we can stop the President's plan to raise taxes by almost \$100 billion this year.

We have tried that before. That is the past. That is the history. I know his poll ratings are high and every time they are high he comes to Congress and he wants to spend more money and raise more taxes. It happened in 1993. We had the largest tax increase in the history of the world. That is why I think I got elected in 1994, because of his tax increase in 1993. I was against it then; I am against it now. I think it is immoral for the Federal Government to take half of what Americans earn.

When we look at it, look at it and see. A great example is the death tax.

Now, the radical left will tell us that the death tax is about nothing more than helping the rich. Say that to the farmer that has spent his entire life with his hands in the soil building a farm, praying to God every year that his crops will come in, praying that he will have something to pass on to his sons and his daughter, only to pass away and have his children have to pay 55 percent to the Federal Government just because he had the bad fortune of dying. Fifty-five percent on money that he has already paid taxes on eight or nine times.

Mr. Speaker, that is obscene. With the new collection of wealth in America, with middle-class Americans that are actually getting to earn a little bit of money and investing in small businesses and using their hands and using their minds and sweating day and night to build a small business in the hope of passing the American dream on to their children, they find out that when they die, they are going to have to pay 55 percent to the Federal Government. And what is going to happen to their small business? What is going to happen to their small farm? They are going to have to sell it. They are going to have to have a sale on the courtroom steps, because their children are not going to have the money to pay death taxes and keep that family business or that family farm running.

Mr. Speaker, it makes no sense. It makes no sense that Americans, while they are alive, spend half of the year paying for taxes, fees and regulations put on them by the government.

Now, what does that mean? That means that when Americans wake up to work on Monday, they are working for the government, and all day they are working for the government. When they wake up and go to work on Tuesday, they are still working to pay taxes, fees and regulations to the government. It is not until they come back from lunch on Wednesday afternoon that they are able to put aside a few dollars for themselves and a few dollars aside for their family and a few dollars aside for a mortgage. God help us all to be able to save a little bit of money for our children's education.

See, this is not the agenda that the President or the radical left want to talk about, because what does this do? Why is this offensive to people on the left? Because it makes sense? It makes sense I think to most Americans. But why is it offensive to people on the left? It is because it takes money out of Washington, D.C., and returns it to Americans.

I think, in the end, the difference between the right and the left is that the left just does not trust Americans with their own money. Like the President of the United States said in Buffalo a few weeks ago: Yeah, we could give you your money and hope that you spend it the right way, but we just cannot do that.

Mr. Speaker, I am hoping that we will be coming to a time in the coming

months that we can debate the real issues and debate the real facts. If we are talking about spending, we will keep spending down, we will adhere to the spending caps that we passed in 1997.

We have had Speaker HASTERT and several others come out this week and talk about their desire to stay in the spending caps. We have had the President of the United States talk about more taxes, more spending, more government, two very separate visions of America.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans are fighting hard to cut taxes. Hopefully, we can cut the death tax. Hopefully, we can help Americans that make \$45,000 to \$60,000 get out of the 28 percent tax bracket and go to the 15 percent tax bracket. Why is an American making \$45,000 paying 28 percent in Federal taxes? That is insane and wrong. The Federal Government has enough money. It does not need money that badly.

Hopefully, when we talk about Social Security we can say no to raiding the Social Security trust fund and say yes to keeping Social Security off budget. Say no to the President's plan of looting Social Security by \$270 billion, according to CBO, and say yes to the Herger plan, the Republican plan, to keep Social Security off budget.

Mr. Speaker, if we do that and if we go back to what we were talking about doing in 1995, which was balancing the budget, cutting taxes, cutting spending, saving Social Security and being responsible with taxpayers' money, then I think we will really be on to something and we will go into the next century and the new millennium a stronger, freer, prouder country than we have in many, many years.

That is my hope, that is my prayer, and that is what I will be fighting for.

ISSUES AFFECTING THE PEOPLE OF GUAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor today in the course of a special order to try to draw some attention to issues which affect the people I represent, the people of Guam.

Mr. Speaker, Guam is a small island about 9,000 miles from here. It has 150,000 proud U.S. citizens and offers the United States a transit point through which military power is projected into that part of the world. It is a cornerstone of America's projection of its military strength in Asia and the Pacific.

Guam has a \$10 billion military infrastructure. Our island is primarily influenced by Asian economic trends, and we have a fair-sized economy for a population of 150,000.

□ 1530

We have a \$3 billion economy that is fueled primarily by tourism. We had

over 1.2 million tourists last year, we anticipate, and we certainly hope that we will get more.

In the course of trying to represent a territory of the United States, the furthest territory from Washington, D.C., and in the course of trying to represent some very special and unique conditions which affect the people I represent, it becomes necessary to try to get some time to enter into the RECORD and to provide some information for those people who happen to be watching some information about the kinds of issues that affect the people of Guam.

I certainly would like to take the time to start off by talking about a very special congressional delegation that went to Guam last month. In February, there was a Pacific congressional delegation headed by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), who is the chairman of the Committee on Resources. He took a delegation which included the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER), the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON), the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA), the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. CHRISTENSEN), and myself through a four-stop trip in the Pacific.

The Committee on Resources, of which the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) is chair, is the committee of jurisdiction and responsibility over the insular areas.

I want to take the time to thank the members of the congressional delegation for taking time from a very busy schedule in order to go out to the Pacific. I think sometimes people think of these as trips that are taken at a very leisurely pace and that not much is learned. But inasmuch as there is a great deal, perhaps, of misinformation or a lack of understanding or firsthand knowledge about the insular areas, I took it as a great opportunity to do a little teaching about the Pacific. I can testify that flying all over the Pacific, in which time is measured in hours of flight time, cannot be very pleasant when you make basically six stops in the course of 10 days.

In the course of the CODELS, the congressional delegation trips, they happened to stop, of course, on Guam. They went to American Samoa, Guam, Saipan in the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas, and Majuro in the Republic of the Marshall Islands.

In the course of stopping in Guam, I would like to say publicly that I certainly appreciate the work of Governor Guterrez and many of the people on Guam who made the visit most pleasant, I think, for the CODEL, the Members, the spouses that attended, as well as the staff that went.

Politics on Guam is very different than politics here. Sometimes when we try to deal with issues, we run into roadblocks of misunderstanding. It is very difficult to try to get the sense or