

measure that we hoped for these past months. In addition, the bill also includes a damaging provision that extends the filing deadline for employment-based applications only for people who have filed a labor certification by August 15, 2001. This already expired filing date puts people in the untenable position of having waited for an extension of section 245(i), only to find that it is too late if they have not already filed the underlying qualifying application. Now we find that people seeking to benefit from the extension must have filed their labor certification applications before August 15, 2001.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member rises in strong opposition to specific portions of H.R. 1885, the 245(i) Extension Act. As you know, a House amendment to H.R. 1885 added the text of H.R. 3525, the Enhanced Border Security and Visa Entry Reform Act, that the House passed by voice vote on December 19, 2001.

While this Member strongly supports the provisions of H.R. 3525 that would include establishing a government-wide electronic data base on persons with terrorist ties, installing a new high-tech visa system to reduce fraud and counterfeiting, increasing the number of full-time Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) employees and requiring a system to electronically track all foreign visa students in the United States; this Member, however, remains strongly opposed to the original provisions of H.R. 1885 regarding the extension of Section 245(i).

This Member's opposition relates to the provisions whereby Section 245(i) allows illegal aliens to buy legal permanent residence for \$1,000. Ironically, on September 11, 2001, the House was scheduled to debate H.R. 1885 on the Floor. Of course, all House action for that day was pre-empted by the horrific and unspeakable terrorists act committed, in part, by illegal aliens. In light of those events, this Member remains amazed that some of his colleagues continue to seek a policy which permits paying for citizenship by persons who entered this country illegally; that simply is not in the best interest or principles of the United States or in U.S. national security interests.

Although the current legal immigration structure is by no means perfect, it does provide for crucial health screening and criminal record background checks which determine if potential immigrants will place the well-being and security of American citizens and legal immigrants in danger. To make such determinations is not only the right of the United States as a sovereign country it should be among our foremost responsibilities, especially in light of the September 11th terrorist attacks.

Mr. Speaker, Section 245(i) ultimately rewards those people who have thwarted the legal immigration structure by entering the country illegally or by allowing their legal status to lapse. Simultaneously, the policy penalizes potential immigrants who have patiently waited many years, completed many forms, and undergone appropriate screenings for the privileged opportunity to be reunited with family members and to work in the United States. The amendments by the other body only worsened the bill by extending the time illegal aliens have to apply.

Mr. Speaker, Section 245(i) was a bad policy when it was first enacted in 1994. It most assuredly was not worthy of being re-instated during the previous 106th Congress, and it

should not be further extended. Furthermore, since H.R. 3525 has already passed the House, a "no" vote on H.R. 1885 would not impede the progress of those important border security and visa entry reform provisions. Extending Section 245(i) is certainly a grave mistake that we should not make at this critical juncture in our country's war on terrorism.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for H.R. 1885, the Enhanced Border Security and Visa Entry Reform Act.

Section 245(i) is a vital provision of U.S. immigration law, allowing eligible immigrants on the cusp of becoming permanent residents to apply for their green cards in the U.S., rather than returning to their home countries to apply. Section 245(i) is available to immigrants residing in the U.S. who are sponsored by close family members, or by employers who cannot find necessary U.S. workers, and on whose behalf petitions were submitted prior to April 1, 2001.

People who apply under Section 245(i) are screened for criminal offenses, health problems, the potential of becoming a public charge, fraud, misrepresentation, and other grounds of inadmissibility. Each applicant will pay a \$1,000 processing fee, thereby generating revenue for the Immigration and Naturalization Service—at no cost to taxpayers.

The issue is not whether these individuals are eligible to become permanent residents—because they already are, but rather the issue is the location from which they are eligible to apply.

Restoring 245(i) is pro-family, pro-business, and fiscally prudent. These individuals have jobs, pay taxes, contribute to the economy, and pay into Social Security. Section 245(i) allows business to retain valuable employees, provides INS with millions of dollars in annual revenue, and allows immigrants to remain with their families while applying for legal permanent residence.

Under H.R. 1885, any immigrant petitions filed before either April 30, 2002, or four months after regulations are issued, would form the basis of Section 245(i) eligibility. However, those who file after April 30, 2001 must demonstrate that the "familial relationship" existed before August 15, 2001, or that the application for labor certification (which is the basis of such petition for classification) was filed before August 15, 2001. Thus, family relationships must have existed before August 15, 2001. For employment-based labor certifications, the labor certification application must have been filed by August 15, 2001.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this common sense legislation to provide hard working individuals who are on the brink of becoming permanent residents the opportunity to apply for their residency here in the U.S.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my disappointment that H.R. 1885 does not include a permanent extension of the Section 245(i) program, or at the very least a one-year extension. I am also very concerned that this measure imposes unfortunate new eligibility restrictions that will greatly limit the pool of potential beneficiaries.

Each day without a permanent extension of this program, Americans with immigrant spouses or children face separation from their families. Statistics from the INS show that approximately seventy-five percent of the immi-

grants who apply for 245(i) relief are the spouses and children of United States citizens and permanent residents.

Extending 245(i) permanently is common sense. It is pro-family, pro-business, and fiscally prudent. It strengthens families by keeping them united; it allows businesses to retain valuable employees; and it provides the INS with millions in annual revenue, at no cost to United States taxpayers.

H.R. 1885 does not do enough to help immigrants in need. While I will support it because it is a good starting point, I urge Congress and the Administration to work together in the future to implement either a one-year or permanent extension of 245(i).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 365.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COLLEGE ACCESS IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2002

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 364) providing for the concurrence of the House with amendment in the Senate amendments to the bill H.R. 1499.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 364

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution, the House shall be considered to have taken from the Speaker's table the bill H.R. 1499 and amendments of the Senate thereto, and to have (1) concurred in the amendment of the Senate to the title, and (2) concurred in the amendment of the Senate to the text with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate, insert the following:

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia College Access Improvement Act of 2002".

#### SEC. 2. PUBLIC SCHOOL PROGRAM.

Section 3(c)(2) of the District of Columbia College Access Act of 1999 (sec. 38-2702(c)(2), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking subparagraphs (A) through (C) and inserting the following:

"(A)(i) in the case of an individual who begins an undergraduate course of study within 3 calendar years (excluding any period of service on active duty in the armed forces, or service under the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.) or subtitle D of title I of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12571 et seq.)) of graduation from a secondary school, or obtaining the recognized equivalent of a secondary school diploma, was domiciled in the District of Columbia for not less than the 12 consecutive

months preceding the commencement of the freshman year at an institution of higher education;

“(ii) in the case of an individual who graduated from a secondary school or received the recognized equivalent of a secondary school diploma before January 1, 1998, and is currently enrolled at an eligible institution as of the date of enactment of the District of Columbia College Access Improvement Act of 2002, was domiciled in the District of Columbia for not less than the 12 consecutive months preceding the commencement of the freshman year at an institution of higher education; or

“(iii) in the case of any other individual and an individual re-enrolling after more than a 3-year break in the individual's postsecondary education, has been domiciled in the District of Columbia for at least 5 consecutive years at the date of application;

“(B)(i) graduated from a secondary school or received the recognized equivalent of a secondary school diploma on or after January 1, 1998;

“(ii) in the case of an individual who did not graduate from a secondary school or receive a recognized equivalent of a secondary school diploma, is accepted for enrollment as a freshman at an eligible institution on or after January 1, 2002; or

“(iii) in the case of an individual who graduated from a secondary school or received the recognized equivalent of a secondary school diploma before January 1, 1998, is currently enrolled at an eligible institution as of the date of enactment of the District of Columbia College Access Improvement Act of 2002;

“(C) meets the citizenship and immigration status requirements described in section 484(a)(5) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1091(a)(5));”.

#### SEC. 3. PRIVATE SCHOOL PROGRAM.

Section 5(c)(1)(B) of the District of Columbia College Access Act of 1999 (sec. 38-2704(c)(1)(B), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking “the main campus of which is located in the State of Maryland or the Commonwealth of Virginia”.

#### SEC. 4. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS.

Section 6 of the District of Columbia College Access Act of 1999 (sec. 38-2705, D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Mayor of the District of Columbia may not use more than 7 percent of the total amount of Federal funds appropriated for the program, retroactive to the date of enactment of this Act (the District of Columbia College Access Act of 1999), for the administrative expenses of the program.

“(2) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ‘administrative expenses’ means any expenses that are not directly used to pay the cost of tuition and fees for eligible students to attend eligible institutions.”;

(2) by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (f) and (g);

(3) by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

“(e) LOCAL FUNDS.—It is the sense of Congress that the District of Columbia may appropriate such local funds as necessary for the programs under sections 3 and 5.”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(h) DEDICATED ACCOUNT FOR PROGRAMS.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The District of Columbia government shall establish a dedicated account for the programs under sections 3 and 5 consisting of the following amounts:

“(A) The Federal funds appropriated to carry out such programs under this Act or any other Act.

“(B) Any District of Columbia funds appropriated by the District of Columbia to carry out such programs.

“(C) Any unobligated balances in amounts made available for such programs in previous fiscal years.

“(D) Interest earned on balances of the dedicated account.

“(2) USE OF FUNDS.—Amounts in the dedicated account shall be used solely to carry out the programs under sections 3 and 5.”.

#### SEC. 5. CONTINUATION OF CURRENT AGGREGATE LEVEL OF AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The District of Columbia College Access Act of 1999 (sec. 38-2701 et seq., D.C. Official Code) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

#### “SEC. 7. LIMIT ON AGGREGATE AMOUNT OF FEDERAL FUNDS FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL AND PRIVATE SCHOOL PROGRAMS.

“The aggregate amount authorized to be appropriated to the District of Columbia for the programs under sections 3 and 5 for any fiscal year may not exceed—

“(1) \$17,000,000, in the case of the aggregate amount for fiscal year 2003;

“(2) \$17,000,000, in the case of the aggregate amount for fiscal year 2004; or

“(3) \$17,000,000, in the case of the aggregate amount for fiscal year 2005.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) PUBLIC SCHOOL PROGRAM.—Section 3(i) of such Act (sec. 38-2702(i), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking “and such sums” and inserting “and (subject to section 7) such sums”.

(2) PRIVATE SCHOOL PROGRAM.—Section 5(f) of such Act (sec. 38-2704(f), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking “and such sums” and inserting “and (subject to section 7) such sums”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation now under consideration, House Resolution 364.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support House Resolution 364, which incorporates amendments by the Senate and by the House to H.R. 1499.

First, I would like to thank and recognize the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), the sponsor of the bill, for her deep interest in education for those who are domiciled in the District of Columbia and for her genuine interest in making our Nation's Capital a place of which all our citizens can be proud and one where visitors from all other countries visit enthusiastically.

I also want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), my predecessor as Chair of the Subcommittee on the District of

Columbia, an original cosponsor of the measure, who was responsible in guiding the original legislation into law in 1999.

Additionally, I want to recognize the support given by the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), as the House passed the legislation in July of 2001 and for his support of the amended version. My appreciation also goes to the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), for guidance in bringing H.R. 1499, as amended by the Senate and the House, back to the floor.

I also extend my gratitude to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS) and other members of the Republican leadership who assisted in crafting an amended bill that is acceptable to both sides of the aisle and both Houses.

The original act provides District of Columbia residents with in-state tuition at public colleges and universities throughout the country. Students are permitted a maximum of \$10,000 per year and a lifetime amount of \$50,000 per student. This resolution, as originally introduced on April 4, 2001, by the gentlewoman from District of Columbia, and cosponsored by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) and myself, expands this benefit to include District of Columbia residents who graduated from high school or received the equivalent of a high school degree before 1998, as well as individuals who begin their postsecondary education more than 3 years after they graduated from high school. The legislation prohibits foreign nationals from participating in the tuition program.

The Senate amended H.R. 1499 under unanimous consent and sent it back to the House on December 13, 2001. The amendment included, inter alia, the expansion of the list of eligible private institutions where D.C. residents could attend by receiving \$2,500 annual stipend, capped at \$12,000 per student, to include historically black colleges and universities nationwide. The original act included only the historically black colleges and universities that were located in Maryland and Virginia.

The House amendment includes some technical amendments. It also retains the Senate provision of including all the HBCUs nationwide and also requires the District government to establish a dedicated account for the program. The House amendment endorses the Senate amendment, expressing the sense of Congress that local funds may be appropriated by the District of Columbia to help with financing the tuition program.

The House amendment adds language that authorizes no more than \$17 million in Federal funds for each of following years: 2003, 2004, and 2005. This amount is the same as the current funding level.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to support this lifetime legislation. This gift of education is a gift that does last

a lifetime. What we are doing today is letting more District of Columbia residents receive that gift. The legislation opens a window of opportunity for countless numbers of District of Columbia residents, and it is another contribution to the growing vitality of the Nation's Capital.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 364, the College Access Improvement Act, as amended by the Senate and as further amended by the bill we offer in the House today. H. Res. 364 would allow more D.C. residents to receive the valuable benefits of the College Access Act passed by Congress in 1999.

I want to thank the Chair of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), and the past Chair of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), who are original cosponsors of this bill; the gentlewoman from Maryland for her consistent work and strong support of the House version, and the gentleman from Virginia, who, with me, sponsored and worked diligently for passage of the original College Access Act.

The Senate amendments before us today are the result of collegial negotiations to produce a consensus bill with our Senate sponsors, particularly the ranking member of the Senate Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, GEORGE VOINOVICH, the chief sponsor of the Senate bill, with the strong support of Senator JOE LIEBERMAN, Chairman of the Senate Government Affairs Committee, and Ranking Member Senator FRED THOMPSON, and chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, DICK DURBIN.

I appreciate the willingness of the House leadership, particularly the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), along with conference chair, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. J.C. WATTS), as well as the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), and the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), to work with us on the amended version of the bill before us today which ensures that the College Access Act, as amended by H. Res. 364, does not exceed its annual appropriation.

We are pleased and appreciative that the College Access Act, including the amendments made by H. Res. 364, have been fully funded by President Bush in his 2003 budget. H. Res. 364, as amended, has the enthusiastic support of Mayor Williams, the Council of the District of Columbia, and especially of D.C. residents.

I want once again to thank Congress for its strong support of the District of Columbia College Access Act of 1999, and to indicate that the benefits to education Congress sought are being

realized. The act is now responsible for nearly 2,500 D.C. students who are attending public colleges and universities nationwide at in-state rates, or receiving a \$2,500 stipend to attend private colleges and universities in the District of Columbia and the region.

□ 1530

It is impossible to overestimate the value and importance of the act to the District which has only an open admissions university and no State university system. A college degree is critical in the District of Columbia because ours is a white collar and technology city and region with few factories and other opportunities for jobs that provide good wages without a college education. The College Access Act provides opportunities for D.C. residents to afford a college education here, in the region and around the country that would be routinely available throughout the Nation with the exception of the District. Now D.C. residents have choices for college education similar to those available to Americans in the 50 States. In no small part because of the success of the College Access Act, the high school class in the District of Columbia of 2001 had 64 percent college attendance compared with the national average of 43 percent.

H. Res. 364 will expand the original College Access Act of 1999 in several significant ways. The bill allows D.C. residents to receive a \$2,500 stipend to attend any historically black college and university in the country rather than only in the region as in the original act. Over 600 D.C. residents are expected to take advantage of this important provision in the first year after enactment.

Second, students who are somewhat older because they graduated prior to 1998 were not included in the original College Access Act because of the Senate's fear that funding would be insufficient. Actually, funding was sufficient; and I appreciate that we have been able to get agreement with the Senate to expand tuition benefits to at least two groups of older students. The first group is D.C. residents currently enrolled in college, regardless of when these students graduated and regardless of the amount of time it took those students to enroll in college. This change will enable approximately 1,000 students previously denied in-state tuition, including many older students, to qualify this year.

A second group of older students will benefit as a result of language that removes a requirement that a student enroll in college no longer than 3 years after high school graduation. The Senate has agreed to remove the 3-year constraint prospectively. Consequently, the first group of students who took longer than 3 years to enroll in college can take advantage of the College Access Act benefits this year. There are many such students in the District because many cannot afford to go to college right out of high school,

and more and more older students are expected to receive tuition assistance in the years to come.

Also included in both the Senate and the House bill is an amendment that closes a loophole that allowed foreign nationals who live in the District to benefit, a result never intended by the sponsors or by either House.

These amendments to the College Access Act will allow thousands of additional D.C. residents who were not included in the original act to receive tuition assistance. Although the Senate did not include all the changes I sought, the agreement on the addition of HBCUs nationwide is especially welcome. This bill deserves our support because it brings higher-education opportunities for the District's young people much closer to those regularly enjoyed routinely in the districts of other Members of Congress. I thank Members for the support they have given the College Access Act and ask for their support for its expansion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is a bill that is very important. It took a lot of time and a lot of attention. Some great staff have been involved in doing it. I mentioned the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for her splendid cooperation and splendid work on this bill. It is very important to our workforce that we have opportunities for college education. I ask this body to very strongly support House Resolution 364.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 364, providing for the concurrence of the House with amendment in the Senate amendments to the bill, H.R. 1499, the District of Columbia College Access Act Technical Corrections Act of 2002.

In 1999, I introduced the District of Columbia College Access Act of 1999, with Delegate ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, which created the D.C. Tuition Assistance Grant Program. This program allows recent high school graduates in D.C. to pay in-state tuition rates of up to \$10,000 annually at public colleges and universities nationwide. Eligible D.C. residents attending private institutions in D.C., Maryland, or Virginia, or Historically Black Colleges and Universities in Maryland and Virginia may receive grants of \$2,500 annually.

It was always my intention that this program would have a broader application. However, financial considerations restricted the scope of the program. Therefore, I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of H.R. 1499. It will open the eligibility requirements to those individuals who graduated from secondary school prior to 1998 and also to individuals who enroll in an institution of higher education more than 3 years after graduating from a secondary school. Additionally, this bill will permit the grants to be applied to tuition expenses at Historically Black Colleges and Universities nationwide.

The popularity of this program among students and parents has risen steadily since its inception. The program has proven to be a successful incentive to retain and attract D.C.

residents. Now, H.R. 1499 ensures that a greater number of D.C. residents are eligible to receive tuition assistance and broaden their educational opportunities at the undergraduate level.

I would like to thank my colleagues in the House and Senate for their work on this bill. We have successfully worked together on this legislation to authorize \$17 million for the Tuition Assistance Grant Program each year through FY 2005.

The expansion of the Tuition Assistance Grant Program will increase the educational opportunities available to D.C. residents. I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 364.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the District of Columbia College Access Improvement Act of 2001. Historically black colleges and universities, or HBCUs as they're known, are important institutions of higher learning in America. This bill recognizes their significance by opening up tuition assistance under the D.C. College Access Act to be used for HBCUs nationwide—not just those in the immediate area.

Under current law, a resident of the District of Columbia may receive \$2,500 per year for tuition at private HBCUs in D.C., Virginia or Maryland. Well, for one thing, there aren't any private HBCUs in Maryland. And the other options can be pretty expensive for a student who will not be receiving other financial help. This bill expands the options for students and broadens the possibilities for residents of the District of Columbia.

HBCUs have received a higher level of awareness thanks to the bi-partisan leadership of many in Congress and the White House. This legislation is yet another step toward raising the role HBCUs serve in the field of higher education.

I thank the sponsors of the bill before the House today and urge my colleagues to support the D.C. College Access Improvement Act.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 364.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CELEBRATING 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 339) expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the Bureau of the Census on the 100th anniversary of its establishment.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 339

Whereas this Nation's Founding Fathers mandated that a census be conducted once every 10 years, and the decennial census remains the only constitutionally mandated data collection activity today;

Whereas the Congress established a permanent "Census Office" in the Department of the Interior on March 6, 1902, and, in 1903, transferred that office to what was then the newly established Department of Commerce and Labor (within which, with more than 700 employees, it comprised the largest of that department's new bureaus);

Whereas Federal, State, and local governments use data collected by the Bureau of the Census in the distribution of funds and in the formulation of public policy in such areas as education, health and veterans' services, nutrition, crime prevention, and economic development, among others;

Whereas the Bureau of the Census supplies statistical data to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Bureau of Economic Analysis, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and other Government agencies charged with measuring and reporting on the health of the Nation's economy;

Whereas the Bureau of the Census is the Nation's largest data collection agency, collecting data used by other Government agencies, tribal governments, institutions, universities, and nonprofit organizations, and supplying information on poverty, unemployment, crime, education, marriage and family, and transportation;

Whereas, throughout its first 100 years, the Bureau of the Census has earned a reputation for scrupulously safeguarding the confidentiality of respondents' answers, a responsibility vital to maintaining the public's trust;

Whereas the Bureau of the Census, with the cooperation of other Government agencies, the Congress, State and local governments, and community organizations, and with significant technological innovation and public outreach, has just conducted this Nation's 22d decennial census in a timely and professional fashion, employing over 500,000 dedicated Americans in the process; and

Whereas March 6, 2002, marks the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the Bureau of the Census: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby—*

(1) recognizes the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the Bureau of the Census; and

(2) acknowledges the achievements and contributions of the Bureau of the Census, and of its current and former employees, to the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 339.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the United States Census Bureau. Last week the Census Bureau celebrated its centennial birthday, 100 years of invaluable service to America. Our Constitution requires us to con-

duct our census, an actual enumeration, every 10 years.

I quote: "The actual enumeration shall be made within 3 years after the first meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent term of 10 years, in such a manner as they shall by law direct."

The conduct of the census for the apportionment of Congress is almost as old as the birth of our Nation. In 1790, Thomas Jefferson, the Secretary of State under George Washington, directed the efforts of the U.S. marshals who would serve as enumerators until the 1880 census.

Mr. Speaker, the census was never easy to conduct. Suspicious residents were not the only difficulty encountered by our Nation during a census. Census forms from Delaware, Georgia, Kentucky, New Jersey and Tennessee were destroyed by the British when they burned the Capitol during the War of 1812.

Throughout our history, censuses have been used to mark significant achievements and milestones in our Nation's history. The 1860 census would show New York as surpassing the 1 million mark in that great city's population. In 1864, General Sherman would use published information on population and agriculture in his war-planning efforts. President Lincoln remarked on the importance of the population information saying: "If we could first know where we are and wither we are tending, we could better judge what to do and how to do it." And one of my favorite Presidents, President Garfield, said: "The census is indispensable to modern statesmanship."

Mr. Speaker, 1878 would mark the first publication of the Statistical Abstract of the United States. Today, with more than 1,500 tables, the Abstract is the Census Bureau's oldest and most popular reference product. The 1890 census marked the first use of the punch card and mechanical tabulating equipment. The 1890 census would also mark the end of the frontier in the United States. Census analysts wrote: "Up to and including the 1880 census, the country had a frontier. At present the unsettled area has been so broken into isolated bodies of settlement that there can hardly be said to be a frontier line."

Mr. Speaker, in 1902 a permanent census office was established in the Department of the Interior and in 1903 the census office became the Census Bureau in the new Department of Commerce and Labor. The 1910 census included for the first time a census of manufacturers. The 1910 census would also have President Taft issuing the first-ever census proclamation.

In 1915, the U.S. population would reach 100 million and the Census Bureau would conduct its first special enumeration for a local government in Tulsa, Oklahoma. In 1942, the Census Bureau moved to its current location in Suitland, Maryland, which is named after Colonel Samuel Taylor Suit, a