

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 telecommunications 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 telecommunications 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

one-third of all men with diabetes, do not even know they have the disease. Despite advances in medical technology and research, the life expectancy of men continues to be an average of 7 years less than women.

Nearly 120,000 men aged 25 to 64 died from heart disease or stroke in 1995. The death rate of men from prostate cancer has increased by 23 percent since 1973. Twenty-seven percent of men will die within one year after having a heart attack.

In 1997, the bulk of government funding for breast cancer research was approximately \$332 million; for prostate cancer, \$82.3 million. An estimated 39,200 men will die of prostate cancer in 1998. It is the second leading cause of cancer death in men.

Women visit doctors 30 percent more than men do. In 1995, nearly three-fourths of heart transplant patients in the United States were male and over 30 percent of men in the United States are overweight.

Why do I reveal these statistics? Because it is vitally important that America get healthy. One simple change would be encouraging men to take an active role, as women do, in regularly visiting their physician for basic treatment and examinations. The rate of male mortality could significantly be reduced if we would encourage men to seek treatment before symptoms have reached a critical stage.

For example, a good friend of mine, Senator Bob Dole, is alive today because he sought early care for prostate cancer. Others, such as Muppet creator, Jim Henson, and Time-Warner Chair, Steve Ross, waited far too long for medical advice.

Now, in 1994, Congress inaugurated National Men's Health Week, which begins this year on June 15 and culminates on Father's Day, June 21.

Why is it vitally important that men become more aware of their health care needs? First and foremost for their longevity. Secondly, for the quality of life. Thirdly, as we look at the Federal budget and the growth of funding in Medicare and other programs, it is vitally important to rein in the costs of spending. It is much better in society for us to take preventive measures, to look at the healthy aspect of life, to look at ways to prevent the onslaught of disease by doing several things: One, exercise; one, controlling fat intake; one, obviously eliminating smoking as part of one's lifestyle; minimizing drinking. All of these things can be accomplished.

In addition for this week, nongender-specific issues such as heart disease, cholesterol count, blood pressure; specific health issues that deal with men such as stroke, colon cancer, prostate cancer, suicide, alcoholism, and men's fear of doctors, among others, should be focused on.

What will a week's difference make in the scheme of things? What will the difference in June 15 to June 21 yield?

Well, when the problems of women's breast cancer and its rising rates became apparent over the past several years, the designation of October as National Breast Cancer Awareness Month enabled a broad collation of health organizations, associations, individual groups and the media to focus on the vital role simple steps such as breast exams can play in preventing this deadly disease. As a result, more women than ever before are taking steps to detect and treat breast cancer in its earlier stages, thereby sustaining their life and preventing the onslaught of a ravaging disease.

By developing an entire week on the broad range of health issues affecting men and ultimately their families, National Men's Health Week attempts to achieve the same positive behavioral changes among men that is already being undertaken by women.

So I urge men to follow the advice, read up on publications, try and exercise in order to preserve their health and, obviously, their family's.

#### DON HENLEY AND THE WALDEN WOODS PROJECT

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

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment to honor a special man, Don Henley. Many of us know Mr. Henley for the numerous hit records that he has produced over the years. He has been recognized countless times for his fine musical achievements.

But today I want to honor Don Henley for something far more than the hit music that he has brought to us over the years. I want to recognize him for the wonderful work that he has done with the Walden Woods project and the Thoreau Institute to preserve the area around Walden Pond. These woods served as an inspiration for Henry David Thoreau's great work, "Walden."

Don Henley was drawn to Thoreau's writings as a high school student growing up in East Texas. He was troubled when he learned that the Walden Woods were threatened in 1989 by two commercial development projects. Plans were underway for the construction of an office complex 700 yards from Thoreau's cabin site and 139 condominiums less than 2 miles from Walden Pond itself.

In 1990, Mr. Henley founded the Walden Woods project, a nonprofit organization focused on the preservation of the land within the Walden Woods ecosystem. The project was able to raise enough money to purchase and to protect 100 acres of the woods, including the two sites slated for development.

Don Henley's work continues as the Walden Woods project has combined efforts with the Thoreau Society to form the Thoreau Institute. On June 5, the Institute was formally inaugurated at

the same beautiful landscape that captivated the attention and the appreciation of the great author.

The Thoreau Institute will work to unite interest in saving the environmental riches of the woods with the study of Thoreau's scholarly writing. The Institute aspires to bring Thoreau's writings to individuals around the world.

Last September, Mr. Henley was awarded a National Humanities Medal by President Clinton for his extraordinary work to save Walden Pond. The President noted that the award was given to those men and women who keep the American memory alive and infuse the future with new ideas.

Mr. Henley has always been committed to the goals of preserving our environment and our natural resources. Through his hard work and his dedication, Don Henley has ensured that the legacy of Walden Pond will continue to be an inspiration for generations to come.

#### SELF-DETERMINATION FOR THE AMERICAN CITIZENS OF PUERTO RICO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Speaker, 3.8 million American citizens of Puerto Rico are eager to exercise self-determination. We care passionately about our political status and we support congressional measures which call for a referendum, define status options, and provide for the implementation of the status choice that prevails.

Opponents of these bills object to the fact that if a majority of the 3.8 million U.S. citizens vote for statehood, a process might begin which would lead to the islands's full incorporation into the United States as an equal partner. So, some may be wondering what is the problem? What is the problem with having American citizens achieve the right to vote and the right to representation? If my colleagues should ask me, nothing. But some Members of Congress want to impose a supermajority requirement on Puerto Rico if we were to vote for statehood. If they have their way, even if a majority of American citizens in Puerto Rico voted for statehood and only 44 percent voted for Commonwealth, we would remain as a Commonwealth.

Why? Why should the will of a minority decide the relationship of 3.8 million American citizens? Why should a minority keep almost 4 million American citizens disenfranchised and denied the right to participate in their Nation's democratic process?

Mr. Speaker, is the imposition of such a threshold not unprecedented and shameful? Of course it is. It is also undemocratic.