

sample to go back and adjust Sarasota, Florida, to adjust Bradenton, Florida, my home area, or to adjust Miami. As if Atlanta has a lot in common statistically with Miami.

That is what they are going to be doing. That is one reason it is going to get thrown out in the courts, but it is just not going to be trusted.

I have proposed, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Census in Congress, ideas to improve the census. We are fully supportive of all the resources that the Census Bureau needs to do the best job possible next year. In fact, this Republican Congress is giving the Census Bureau \$200 million more than requested by the administration during the past 2 years to get prepared for this census.

For example, one area that we have already passed out of subcommittee and that is something called post-census local review. I think that is very important to build trust in our census. It was used in 1990. What it basically consists of is, after the Census Bureau conducts the census, they will send the numbers to the local cities and counties to give them a brief time to review the numbers and check for errors. It is kind of an audit. And then if they have questions or problems with it, they can let the Census Bureau know and the Census Bureau will go back and check those numbers.

Now, in 1990, Detroit added 45,000 people. Cleveland added people. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) talked about a whole ward that was mistakenly left out of one of his areas in his congressional district in Wisconsin. Mistakes are made. The Bureau is not perfect. But they are refusing to allow cities and counties the opportunity to check the numbers before they become official.

Every elected official in the country should be supportive of this. It is only the Census Bureau that says, "Oh, it's a pain. It's too much trouble. We don't want to deal with trouble."

We have got to build trust in this census. What you are doing by not allowing post-census local review as was allowed in 1990 is you are building up distrust already because you are trying to hide something. That is wrong. We need to build up that confidence that we are doing the right thing. Why not let the local cities and counties have the opportunity to review the numbers? But, no, they are so fixated on this second number census that they will not do anything to improve and build on the full enumeration.

Mr. Speaker, we need to go to a full enumeration for all Americans to be counted in the year 2000.

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

(Mr. PALLONE 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 gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

#### INTRODUCING LEGISLATION TO PROTECT SATELLITE HOME VIEWERS

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

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to yield half of that time to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Telecommunications, but let me first inform the House and the American public that, as many now know, consumers across America have been notified that they will soon lose access to network programming signals that are currently delivered via satellite.

Satellite television distributors are under now a Federal court order to terminate delivery of these network signals because of a finding that distributors have violated the Satellite Home Viewers Act. What we learned in the subcommittee yesterday was that, with new FCC findings, some 220,000 American citizens who are scheduled to be terminated from network signal delivery are, in fact, qualified to receive those signals legally under the act.

What we are announcing today is the filing of a moratorium bill, with the support of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and a lot of other members of our committee and Members of this Congress, a moratorium bill to give us 90 days to work this problem out without unnecessarily cutting off Americans from network programming delivered by satellite. It is intolerable that over 200,000 citizens would be terminated in that service without giving them a chance to qualify under the act according to the FCC's new findings.

Let me point out we are not suggesting in our legislation that any violations of law be tolerated. Those folks who can receive local signals are going to have to do so. But the hundreds of thousands who are going to get cut off this weekend unnecessarily should not be cut off, and we are hopeful that this moratorium bill can become law quickly next week in order to protect their rights.

We had hoped that the parties could settle this. We still encourage them to do so this weekend. We had hoped that the broadcast and satellite industries would walk into court this weekend together and ask the court to modify its injunction to incorporate the new FCC findings so that these hundreds of thousands of Americans would not lose their network signals.

But unless the parties go to court this weekend and modify the injunc-

tion, our only way to protect those consumers while we work with the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Commerce on a new Satellite Home Viewers Act to provide those local signals to consumers, our only hope will be this moratorium bill which we are filing today and which we intend to move expeditiously next week absent an agreement by the parties to do so.

I yield to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman points out, there are thousands of people across the country who are affected by this court ordered cut-off of distant TV signals, meaning that people with satellite dishes cannot pick up the national NBC or CBS or ABC or Fox feed. Specifically here I think CBS and Fox are in question.

The legislation that we are introducing today will help give consumers limited relief to reapply for permission to obtain these signals or to apply for waivers from their local broadcasters, that is, write or visit their local TV station and say, "Please, I can't get your signal here locally. Let me take this national feed so I can gain advantage to the programming, news and entertainment that are so valuable for my family."

Equally important, it will give Congress additional time to develop a long-term plan to update the Satellite Home Viewer Act and to include permission for satellite local-to-local broadcasts. Meaning that we have to now develop as a strategy a way in which an individual with an 18-inch dish now, to pick up their local TV stations.

Today, they cannot do that. Today, it is impossible. If you want to have a satellite dish, you have to give up access to your local TV stations. You have got to put up your own antenna. You have got to subscribe to the cable service as a supplement.

□ 1230

But you cannot get it all from a satellite dish.

What we are going to try to do this year is craft legislation that will make it possible for you to buy an 18-inch satellite dish, pick up all of that great cable and satellite programming and have access to your local TV stations at the same time. Then people will have real consumer choice.

So, the legislation, which has been drafted by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) working with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and I and other members of our committee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER) and a long list of Members is something which we think makes lot of sense. But again, we have this moment arriving where on March 31 all regulation of the cable industry goes off the books, and we, as the committee, are going to have to respond. We are going to have to find ways of insuring that the consumers

have access to more competition and that there is a real protection.

#### PROVIDING FOR COMPETITION IN THE CABLE INDUSTRY

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for doing so because I would be remiss if I did not second what the gentleman has just said, that we are about to see the complete deregulation of cable in America at the end of March. If American citizens cannot receive network programming over their satellites when they are entitled to receive it, they are going to be forced to either climb up on the roof and try to put up antennas that may or may not get good signals or go back to the monopoly cable company which will be deregulated.

We in this Chamber, and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) has been a valiant soldier in this effort along with me and others, have tried to desperately make sure that cable has a competitor out there before they are deregulated. This court decision means for thousands of Americans, hundreds of thousands of Americans, they are forced back into a cable monopoly instead of a competitive choice.

It is critical that we find a solution this year to get local signals into the satellite feed so that Americans have a real choice when cable is deregulated. You and I know when there is only one store in town, you get bad prices, bad service and bad quality of products. But when you got a choice, when there are two stores in town, prices get better, service gets better, quality gets better.

Americans deserve a choice in television. This moratorium is just a stop-gap measure to help us find that solution, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MARKEY. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, for a consumer, if they subscribe to cable today, they can get all of their local TV stations on that cable system. If they subscribe to satellite, they cannot get the local channels. The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) and I, and the other members of our committee, we are going to try to rectify this.

If Tip O'Neill was here today and looking at these issues, he would say that all politics of satellites are local, into local. How do we provide local people with their local TV stations? We are going to try to do that this year, and, I think, provide real competition through wireless, through satellite and other technologies to the cable industry and give the consumer a real break.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. CAPPS (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today through March 10, on account of illness in the family.

Mr. PASTOR (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of official business, traveling to the district with the President of the United States.

Mr. KOLBE (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, on account of traveling with the President to Arizona for meetings on Social Security.

Mr. ROYCE (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, on account of observing the elections in Nigeria.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TURNER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TAUZIN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MARKEY, for 5 minutes, today.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 433. An act to restore the management and personnel authority of the Mayor of the District of Columbia.

#### BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for this approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 433. To restore the management and personnel authority of the Mayor of the District of Columbia.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 1, 1999, at 2 p.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

749. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Sweet Onions Grown in the Walla Walla Valley of Southeast Washington and Northeast Oregon: Order Amending Marketing Agreement and Order No. 956 [Docket Nos. 98AMA-FV-956-1; FV98-956-1] received February 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

750. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Milk in the Nebraska-Western Iowa Marketing Area: Suspension of Certain Provisions of the Order [DA-98-10] received February 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

751. A letter from the Administrator, Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Fees for Rice Inspection (RIN: 0580-AA67) received February 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

752. A letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Small Hog Operation Payment Program (RIN: 0560-AF70) received February 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

753. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—List of Communities Eligible for the Sale of Flood Insurance [Docket No. FEMA-7706] received February 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

754. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—Impact Aid—received February 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

755. A letter from the Deputy Executive Director and Chief Operating Officer, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing Benefits—received February 8, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

756. A letter from the Director, Regulations Management and Policy Staff, FDA, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Standards for Animal Food and Food Additives in Standardized Animal Food [Docket No. 95N-0313] received February 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

757. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Laxative Drug Products for Over-the-Counter Human Use [Docket No. 78N-036L] (RIN: 0910-AA01)