OVERSIGHT OF THE 2000 CENSUS: DISCUSSION OF THE EFFECTS OF INCLUDING PUERTO RICO IN THE 2000 U.S. POPULATION TOTALS

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT REFORM

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED SIXTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

SEPTEMBER 22, 1999

Serial No. 106–66

Printed for the use of the Committee on Government Reform

Available via the World Wide Web: http://www.house.gov/reform

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

61–630 CC WASHINGTON : 2000

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM

DAN BURTON, Indiana, *Chairman*

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, New York
CONSTANCE A. MORELLA, Maryland
CHRISTOPHER SHAYS, Connecticut
ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, Florida
JOHN M. MCHUGH, New York
STEPHEN HORN, California
JOHN L. MICA, Florida
THOMAS M. DAVIS, Virginia
DAVID M. MCINTOSH, Indiana
MARK E. SOUDER, Indiana
JOE SCARBOROUGH, Florida
STEVEN C. LATOURETTE, Ohio
MARSHALL "MARK" SANFORD, South Carolina
BOB BARR, Georgia
DAN MILLER, Florida
ASA HUTCHINSON, Arkansas
LEE TERRY, Nebraska
JUDY BIGGERT, Illinois
GREG WALDEN, Oregon
DOUG OSE, California
PAUL RYAN, Wisconsin
HELEN CHENOWETH, Idaho
DAVID VITTER, Louisiana

HENRY A. WAXMAN, California
TOM LANTOS, California
ROBERT E. WISE, JR., West Virginia
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
EDOLPHUS TOWNS, New York
PAUL E. KANJORSKI, Pennsylvania
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
CAROLYN B. MALONEY, New York
ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, Washington, DC
CHAKA FATTAH, Pennsylvania
ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS, Maryland
DENNIS J. KUCINICH, Ohio
ROD R. BLAGOJEVICH, Illinois
DANNY K. DAVIS, Illinois
JOHN F. TIERNEY, Massachusetts
JIM TURNER, Texas
THOMAS H. ALLEN, Maine
HAROLD E. FORD, JR., Tennessee
JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY, Illinois

BERNARD SANDERS, Vermont (Independent)

KEVIN BINGER, *Staff Director*
DANIEL R. MOLL, *Deputy Staff Director*
DAVID A. KASS, *Deputy Counsel and Parliamentarian*
CARLA J. MARTIN, *Chief Clerk*
PHIL SCHILIRO, *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS

DAN MILLER, Florida, *Chairman*

THOMAS M. DAVIS, Virginia
PAUL RYAN, Wisconsin
MARK E. SOUDER, Indiana

CAROLYN B. MALONEY, New York
DANNY K. DAVIS, Illinois
HAROLD E. FORD, JR., Tennessee

EX OFFICIO

DAN BURTON, Indiana

HENRY A. WAXMAN, California

THOMAS B. HOFELLER, *Staff Director*
JENNIFER M. SAFAVIAN, *Chief Counsel*
AMY ALTHOFF, *Clerk*
DAVID MCMILLEN, *Minority Professional Staff Member*

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held on September 22, 1999	1
Statement of:	
Angueira, Teresa, Assistant Division Chief, Decennial Management Division	63
Faleomavaega, Hon. Eni F.H., a Delegate in Congress from American Samoa	26
Prewitt, Kenneth, Director, Bureau of the Census	40
Romero-Barceló, Hon. Carlos A., the Resident Commissioner in Congress from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico	19
Serrano, Hon. José E., a Representative in Congress from the State of New York	17
Letters, statements, et cetera, submitted for the record by:	
Davis, Hon. Danny K., a Representative in Congress from the State of Illinois, prepared statement of	16
Faleomavaega, Hon. Eni F.H., a Delegate in Congress from American Samoa, prepared statement of	28
Maloney, Hon. Carolyn B., a Representative in Congress from the State of New York, prepared statement of	9
Miller, Hon. Dan, a Representative in Congress from the State of Florida, prepared statement of	4
Prewitt, Kenneth, Director, Bureau of the Census, prepared statement of	46
Romero-Barceló, Hon. Carlos A., the Resident Commissioner in Congress from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, prepared statement of	22

OVERSIGHT OF THE 2000 CENSUS: DISCUSSION OF THE EFFECTS OF INCLUDING PUERTO RICO IN THE 2000 U.S. POPULATION TOTALS

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 1999

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10 a.m., in room 2203, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Dan Miller (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Miller, Davis of Illinois, Maloney, and Ford.

Staff present: Thomas W. Brierton, deputy staff director; Jennifer M. Safavian, chief counsel; Timothy J. Maney, chief investigator; David Flaherty, senior data analyst; Chip Walker, communications director; Jo Powers, assistant press secretary; Amy Althoff, clerk; Michelle Ash, minority counsel; David McMillen, minority professional staff member; and Ellen Rayner, minority chief clerk.

Mr. MILLER. Good morning. With a quorum present, we will proceed with opening statements by myself and Mrs. Maloney, and then we'll proceed to the first panel with three distinguished Members of Congress.

Today, the subcommittee will be exploring a very interesting and important topic: the collection, tabulation, and reporting of the 2000 census data from Puerto Rico.

The United States has long enjoyed a prosperous relationship with the island of Puerto Rico, first as a hemispheric neighbor and, in the 20th century, as a U.S. Commonwealth.

All Puerto Ricans are U.S. citizens, as provided by the Jones Act, which was enacted into law in 1917. These citizens have made a tremendous contribution to the United States. Countless Puerto Ricans have served in our Nation's armed forces, fighting in all of America's conflicts in the 20th century in order to protect the freedoms we all hold dear. Puerto Rico's economy, its capable and industrious work force, and strategic location make it a vital center of American commerce in the Caribbean and Latin America. And many Puerto Ricans have chosen to immigrate to the mainland, helping to expand our economy and enrich our cultural heritage.

American citizens, whether in Puerto Rico or in the 50 States and the District of Columbia, have much in common. They share the same values of hard work and honesty and appreciate the im-

portance of family, faith, and freedom. As a result of the 2000 census, that connection will grow even stronger. They will be enumerated using the same forms in the decennial census.

In the previous censuses, Puerto Rico, as well as other U.S. Commonwealths and related territories, were counted using a different census form than the 50 States and the District of Columbia. Different enumeration techniques were also used. In 2000, it is our understanding that the forms and techniques to be used in Puerto Rico will be far more similar, and in many cases identical to, those techniques used in the 50 States and the District of Columbia. I am sure Dr. Prewitt will be able to elaborate on this subject in detail during his testimony.

Thus, in the past, the Census Bureau used different forms and different enumeration techniques in Puerto Rico than they did in the 50 States while still seeking similar data. When it reported on the data it collected in Puerto Rico in the 1990 census, the Bureau placed it in a category separate from the data collected from the 50 States and the District of Columbia. Consequently, any national data products and statistics from the 1990 census, such as the percentage of homes with two or more cars or the percentage of children living below the poverty line, did not include data from Puerto Rico in the overall population totals on which they were based. Under current policy, the total population of the United States does not include Puerto Rico, or any other U.S. territory for that matter. The population figures used by the Census Bureau for the total U.S. population include only the 50 States and the District of Columbia.

As I mentioned earlier, the Bureau has changed the way it will enumerate Puerto Rico in the 2000 census. The same short and a similar long form as used in the 50 States and the District of Columbia will now be used in Puerto Rico. As a result, the data gathered in Puerto Rico will for the first time be compatible with and potentially could be included in the overall U.S. totals for official Census Bureau data products, as I am certain Dr. Prewitt will explain for us.

This new compatibility of data leads to the important policy question we will examine today. Should the Census Bureau include the data from Puerto Rico in the overall U.S. totals or should it continue to keep Puerto Rico separate from the total including the 50 States and the District of Columbia?

While this may seem to be just a simple change in calculating the total population of the United States, the policy considerations of this decision are not insignificant. There are many questions that should be examined before a determination is made on how to proceed with reporting the data. To highlight just a few: One, how will the inclusion of Puerto Rico affect the numerous data products produced by the Census Bureau and other agencies?

What effects will the inclusion of data on Puerto Rico have on Federal policy decisions that primarily impact the 50 States and the District of Columbia?

Would the inclusion of Puerto Rico negatively affect data comparisons from the 2000 census to earlier censuses, essentially rendering them apples and oranges?

If we decide to include Puerto Rico, should we then include the population totals of other American Commonwealths, related territories and possessions as well?

Is this potential change significant enough to be better decided by a separate vote on authorizing legislation on the floor of the House and Senate, rather than nonbinding report language in an authorization bill?

Is there sufficient time and technical resources for the Bureau to make these changes in reporting data on Puerto Rico for the 2000 census?

Our colleague from New York, the Honorable José Serrano, believes strongly that Puerto Rico should be included in the U.S. totals. He has proposed, through the use of report language in the Commerce Justice State appropriations bill, to instruct the Census Bureau to begin including Puerto Rico in the final data products for the United States, including population totals. I'm pleased he's here to explain his proposal.

We are also fortunate to have with us the Honorable Carlos Romero-Barceló, Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico and the official voice of the people of Puerto Rico in the U.S. Congress. Prior to being elected Resident Commissioner in 1992, Mr. Romero-Barceló was elected Governor of Puerto Rico in 1976. I look forward to hearing his unique insights and benefiting from his experience on this issue.

We are also joined by the Delegate from American Samoa who will provide a perspective on the people of American Samoa, whose status in the official Census Bureau population reports is currently similar to that of Puerto Rico.

And, finally, Census Bureau Director Kenneth Prewitt is here to give us the reaction of the Census Bureau to Mr. Serrano's proposal. He will be commenting on the Bureau's ability to collect and disseminate the data from Puerto Rico and to advise us on any technical considerations regarding the proposal.

On behalf of the ranking member, Mrs. Maloney, and the other members of the subcommittee, I would like to thank all of our witnesses for coming here today; and we look forward to an enlightening and informative hearing.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Dan Miller follows:]

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS
The Honorable Dan Miller, Chairman

H1-114 O'Neill House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
September 22, 1999

Contact: Chip Walker
202/226-1973

OPENING STATEMENT

HEARING ON INCLUDING PUERTO RICO IN 2000 CENSUS NATIONAL DATA PRODUCTS

Good morning.

Today, this Subcommittee will be exploring a very interesting and important topic: the collection, tabulation, and reporting of 2000 census data from Puerto Rico.

The United States has long enjoyed a prosperous relationship with the island of Puerto Rico, first as a hemispheric neighbor, and in the 20th century, as a United States Commonwealth.

All Puerto Ricans are citizens of the United States, as provided by the Jones Act, which was enacted into law in 1917. These citizens have made a tremendous contribution to the United States. Countless Puerto Ricans have served in our nation's armed forces, fighting in all of America's conflicts in the 20th century in order to protect the freedoms we all hold dear. Puerto Rico's economy, its capable and industrious workforce, and strategic location make it a vital center of American commerce in the Caribbean and Latin America. And many Puerto Ricans have chosen to immigrate to the mainland helping to expand our economy and enrich our cultural heritage.

American citizens, whether in Puerto Rico or in the 50 States and the District of Columbia, have much in common. They share the same values of hard work and honesty, and appreciate the importance of family, faith, and freedom. As a result of the 2000 Census, that connection will grow even stronger; they will be enumerated using the same forms in the decennial census.

In previous censuses, Puerto Rico, as well as other U.S. Commonwealths and related territories, were counted using a different census form than the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Different enumeration techniques were also used. In 2000, it is our understanding that the forms and techniques to be used in Puerto Rico will be far more similar, and in many cases identical to, those techniques used in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. I am sure Dr. Prewitt will be able to elaborate on this subject in detail during his testimony.

Thus, in the past, the Census Bureau used different forms and different enumeration techniques in Puerto Rico than they did in the 50 states while still seeking similar data. When it reported on the data it collected in Puerto Rico in the 1990 census, the Bureau placed it in a category separate from the data collected from the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Consequently, any national data products and statistics from the 1990 census, such as the percentage of homes with 2 or more cars or the percentage of children living below the poverty line, did not include data from Puerto Rico in the overall population totals on which they were based. Under current policy, the total population of the United States does not include Puerto Rico, or any other U.S. Territory for that matter. The population figures used by the Census Bureau for the total U.S. population include only the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

As I mentioned earlier, the Bureau has changed the way it will enumerate Puerto Rico in the 2000 Census. The same short and a similar long form as used in the 50 states and the District of Columbia will now be used in Puerto Rico. As a result, the data gathered in Puerto Rico will for the first time be compatible with and potentially could be included in the overall United States totals for official Census Bureau data products, as I am certain Dr. Prewitt will explain for us.

This new compatibility of data leads to the important policy question we will examine today. SHOULD the Census Bureau include the data from Puerto Rico in the overall United States totals, or should it continue to keep Puerto Rico separate from the total including the 50 states and the District of Columbia?

While this may seem to be just a simple change in calculating the total population of the United States, the policy considerations of this decision are not insignificant. There are many questions that should be examined before a determination is made on how to proceed with reporting the data. To highlight just a few:

1) How will the inclusion of Puerto Rico affect the numerous data products produced by the Census Bureau and other agencies?
2) What effects will the inclusion of data on Puerto Rico have on federal policy decisions that primarily impact the 50 states and the District of Columbia?
3) Would the inclusion of Puerto Rico negatively affect data comparisons from the 2000 Census to earlier censuses, essentially rendering them apples and oranges?
4) If we decide to include Puerto Rico, should we then include the population totals of other American Commonwealths, related territories, and possessions as well?
5) Is this potential change significant enough to be better decided by a separate vote on authorizing legislation on the floor of the House and Senate, rather than non-binding report language in an authorization bill?
6) Is there sufficient time and technical resources for the Bureau to make these changes in reporting data on Puerto Rico for the 2000 census?

Our colleague from New York, the Honorable José Serrano, believes strongly that Puerto Rico should be included in the United States totals. He has proposed, through the use of report language in the Commerce Justice State appropriations bill, to instruct the Census Bureau to begin including Puerto Rico in the final data products for the United States including population totals. I am pleased that he is here with us today to explain his proposal.

We are also fortunate to have with us the Honorable Carlos Romero-Barceló, Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico and the official voice of the people of Puerto Rico in the United States Congress. Prior to being elected resident commissioner in 1992, Mr. Romero-Barceló was elected Governor of Puerto Rico in 1976. I look forward to hearing his unique insights and benefiting from his experience on this issue.

We are also joined by the Honorable Eni F.H. Faleomavaega, Delegate from American Samoa. Mr. Faleomavaega will provide the perspective of the people of American Samoa, whose status in official Census Bureau population reports is currently similar to that of Puerto Rico.

Finally, Census Bureau Director Kenneth Prewitt is here to give us the reaction of the Census Bureau to Mr. Serrano's proposal. He will be commenting on the Bureau's ability to collect and disseminate the data from Puerto Rico, and to advise us of any technical considerations regarding the proposal.

On behalf of the ranking Member, Ms. Maloney, and the other Members of the subcommittee I'd like to thank all of our witnesses for coming here today. We look forward to an enlightening and informative hearing.

Mr. MILLER. Mrs. Maloney.

Mrs. MALONEY. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for calling this hearing.

Unlike a number of the hearings we have had over the years now that the Census Subcommittee has been in existence, I can say sincerely that I'm very pleased that the chair has called for today's hearing. How we plan to tabulate the census information for the 2000 census is clearly an important issue that benefits from a full and open discussion.

I would also like to share that in preparing for this hearing I learned a great deal. I've had a new education in the history of the census, how it's been conducted over the decades and territories from the 19th century to the present, and I look forward to learning even more from our witnesses today.

I would like to commend the Delegate from Puerto Rico for the work he and the Governor have done on this issue. I understand that their hard work and partnership with the census has gotten us to the point where I believe we'll be having a very successful 2000 census on Puerto Rico.

I had an opportunity to meet Governor—Delegate Romero-Barceló when he was Governor, literally, of Puerto Rico. I went and visited him there, and it's been an honor to work with him here in Congress.

I look forward also to my colleague, Carlos Eni Faleomavaega from Samoa, who will be testifying. And we'll be hearing from other Delegates, too, maybe not in the hearing but in their prepared testimonies that they will submit.

I am especially pleased to welcome my fellow New Yorker, Mr. Serrano, for having raised this issue in the first place. Regrettably, I think we have been too distracted with other issues and have been unable to focus on problems and policy issues like those that Mr. Serrano has raised here today. I'm glad that we have the opportunity to turn to them now. I'd like to take this opportunity, really, to thank Representative Serrano for his leadership and commitment, along with Mr. Miller's, in securing the full funding for the census.

And I just want to note that in today's CQ Daily Monitor, Mr. Young states that we'll be going to a CR and that there won't be any extra emergency spending or policy provisions added on. So, we will need to make adjustments for the census to make sure the money is there for the ad campaign and all the other important things that need to go forward. So, your work continues, thanks to the work of the Census Bureau and partnership with the people of Puerto Rico.

There is now the option of full inclusion of the people of Puerto Rico in the census data provided to the Nation by the Census Bureau. If, as Mr. Serrano suggests, the Census Bureau is to tabulate the people of Puerto Rico fully into the Nation's totals, that would mean that when the Census Bureau releases data on, say, the Nation's Hispanic population, the statistics would include the residents of Puerto Rico. Similarly, were we to talk about how many people of Puerto Rican descent there are in the United States fully integrated, the census data today would finally give us a number that actually includes the people on the island of Puerto Rico. By

raising this issue early enough for its consideration, we in the Congress, the Census, and the people of Puerto Rico can make an intelligent policy decision on this matter.

I look very much forward to the testimony by the Census Bureau. If there are sound scientific reasons for not including Puerto Rico, as requested by Representative Serrano, I look forward to hearing them. If not, I hope the Director will tell us what needs to be done so that all the people of Puerto Rico will not only be counted in the 2000 census, but fully tabulated, which I have learned is as important as being counted. Based on what I've learned so far, I think examining the issue of Puerto Rico counting strategy is the least we should do.

Again, I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for holding this hearing and I look forward to the comments from my colleagues and other Representatives.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Carolyn B. Maloney follows:]

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE CAROLYN B. MALONEY FOR THE HEARING ON TABULATING PUERTO RICO IN THE CENSUS

SEPTEMBER 22, 1999

Thank you Mr. Chairman for calling this hearing. Unlike a number of the hearings we have had over the, now, *years* that the Census subcommittee has been in existence, I can say sincerely that I am very pleased that the Chair has called for today's hearing. How we plan to tabulate the Census information for the 2000 Census is clearly an important issue that will benefits from a full and open discussion.

I would also like to share that in preparing for this hearing, I learned a great deal. I have had a fascinating education in the history of the Census, how it has been conducted over the decades in territories, from the 19th Century to the present. And I look forward to learning even more from our witnesses.

I would like to commend the Delegate from Puerto Rico for the work he and the Governor have done on this issue. I understand that their hard work in partnership with the Census has gotten us to the point where I believe we will be having a very successful 2000 Census on Puerto Rico.

And I also look forward to the testimony of our other delegates from the territories to learn not only what they think about this issue of tabulation but how preparations are going.

I especially want to thank my fellow New Yorker, Mr. Serrano for having raised this issue in the first place. Regrettably I think we have been to distracted with other issues and have been unable to focus on problems and policy issues like those that Mr. Serrano raises here today. I am glad that we have the opportunity to turn to them now.

Thanks to the work of the Census Bureau in partnership with the people of Puerto Rico, there is now the option of full inclusion of the people of Puerto Rico in the census data provided to the nation by the Census Bureau.

If, as Mr. Serrano suggests, the Census bureau is to tabulate the people of Puerto Rico fully into the nations totals, that would mean that when the Census Bureau releases data on, say, the nation's Hispanic population, the statitics would include the residents of Puerto Rico.

Similarly, were we to talk about how many people of Puerto Rican decent there are in the United States, fully integrating the Census data would finally give us a number that actually includes the people on the island of Puerto Rico. By rasing this issue early enough for its consideration, we the Congress, the Census and the people of Puerto Rico can make an intelligent policy decision on this matter.

I look forward to the testimony by the Census Bureau. If there are sound scientific reasons for not including Puerto Rico as requested by Rep. Serrano, I look forward to hearing them.

If not, I hope the Director will tell us what needs to be done so that all the people of Puerto Rico will not only be counted in the 2000 Census but fully tabulated, which I have learned is as important as being counted. Based on what I have learned so far, I think examining the issue of Puerto Rico counting strategy is the least we should do.

Again, thank you Mr. Chairman for holding this hearing, and I look forward to the comments from my colleagues.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you, Mrs. Maloney.

I would make one comment about the issue of the CR that very possibly will include Commerce Justice. We're very aware of it. I know Mr. Serrano, the ranking member, will be very supportive of the necessity for the census to have a higher amount of money as of October 1 because of the advertising in particular but also because of the dramatic buildup in the census that will be provided for us. So we have been in communication with the Census Subcommittee and with the Commerce Justice Subcommittee and Appropriation Committee to make sure that we have that taken care of. So, we need to be on top of that issue.

Mr. Davis, did you have an opening statement?

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I do have a brief statement I would like to make.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank you for convening this hearing.

Regarding the facts of including Puerto Rico in the 2000 U.S. population totals, as census day rapidly approaches, it is important that we continue to do everything that we possibly can to get the most accurate census. We cannot afford to have the significant undercount that we had in 1990. Of course, in my district alone, the undercount for African Americans was triple that of the undercount for Cook County. The undercount may have led to an underrepresentation in government and fewer resources like the schools' Head Start programs and senior citizens facilities. Thus, the question that confronts us today regarding whether Puerto Rico's census numbers should be included in the U.S. population totals for 2000 is a relevant one.

The proponents for this argument, of course, that Puerto Rico is a territory, should be treated as the District of Columbia and have its numbers put in with the U.S. totals. This is an interesting, as well as I think relevant, concept.

Of course, the opponents argue that allowing Puerto Rico's numbers to be included in the U.S. totals would disrupt the apportionment and the drawing of congressional districts. In addition, they argue the numbers would skew formula distributions of Federal moneys to States.

Obviously, all of us want to ensure that the States receive fair resource allocation and representation based upon the populations, and that is why I think it's so important that we have this hearing today. I certainly look forward to hearing the views of Dr. Prewitt as it relates to the question. I also look forward to hearing any other information that he would have to share with us.

I want to thank the witnesses, especially my distinguished colleagues, for not only their interest in the issue but also for bringing the issue to the forefront so that we can analyze it, look at it, better understand it and hopefully end up with a conclusion that provides the fairest, most accurate, most representative census that this country has ever seen. So I thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and certainly look forward to the witnesses.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Danny K. Davis follows:]

DANNY K. DAVIS
7TH DISTRICT, ILLINOIS
COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT
COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515–1307

DISTRICT OFFICE:
3333 WEST ARTHINGTON STREET
SUITE 130
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60624
(773) 533-7520

WASHINGTON OFFICE:
ROOM 1218
LONGWORTH HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515
(202) 225-5006

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE DANNY K. DAVIS
"Census Subcommittee Hearing"
Wednesday, September 22, 1999

Mr. Chairman, thank you for convening this hearing regarding the effects of including Puerto Rico in the 2000 U.S. population totals. As Census day rapidly approaches it is important that we continue to do everything we can to get the most accurate census possible.

We can not afford to have the significant undercount that we had in 1990. In my district alone the undercount for African Americans was triple that of the undercount for Cook County. The undercount may have led to an underrepresentation in government and fewer precious resources, like schools, head start programs, and senior citizen facilities.

Thus, the question that confronts today regarding whether or not Puerto Rico's Census numbers should be included in the U.S. population totals for the 2000 is a relevant one. The proponents for this argue that Puerto Rico as a territory should be treated as the District of Columbia and have its numbers put in with the U.S. totals. This is a interesting concept.

The opponents argue that allowing Puerto Rico's numbers to be included in the U.S. totals would disrupt apportionment and the drawing of congressional districts. In addition, they argue that the numbers would skew formula distributions of federal monies to the states.

Obviously, we want to ensure that the states receive fair resource allocation and representation based on their population, and that is why it is important that we get the most accurate census possible.

I look forward to hearing the views of Dr. Kenneth Prewitt as it relates to this question. I also look forward to receiving an update as to the progress we have made in preparing for the 2000 Census. I want to thank our distinguished witnesses and I look forward to your testimony.

Thank you.

PRINTED ON RECYCLED PAPER

Mr. MILLER. Thank you, Mr. Davis.

If the first three witnesses, all Members of Congress, would please join us up here: Mr. Serrano, Mr. Romero-Barceló, and Mr. Faleomavaega.

Mr. Serrano, of course, is the ranking member of Commerce Justice, which has a very direct impact on the census since it funds the census. While I do not have a large Puerto Rican population, I do say I have some very important members of the Puerto Rican community because I have Mr. Romero-Barceló's in-laws in my district and so he does visit my district in Sarasota to visit his in-laws. We all joined Congress together, both Mr. Faleomavaega and Mr. Romero-Barceló.

Mr. Serrano.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. SERRANO. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

First, let me say that I remain totally committed, as the ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State and the Judiciary, to making sure the census gets complete funding. That is an issue you know we fought on that subcommittee, and we will continue to fight. As we go forward, we will do everything that we have to do to make sure that the census gets the proper funding on time so it can do the work that it has to do.

Second, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you in a kind of amazed way for calling this hearing and putting it together. I'm amazed because I'm finding out as I get older in politics that sometimes what appears to be the simplest of issues becomes the most discussed of issues, and sometimes the more complicated issues get very little discussion.

When I first proposed this in 1990 and then again in 1993 and most recently with the language we are examining here for me, it was such a simple issue that I thought I would either get a quick yes or a total ignoring—which happened for years until you came along—ignoring of the issue but never the attention that it's getting now. So I thank you, in some sort of amazement, that this very simple issue has become such a topic of discussion.

I see it as simple, Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, because to me the relationship between Puerto Rico and the United States has always been based on citizenship and not necessarily on the status question. And so, until we resolve the status question of Puerto Rico—and we will some day, I am hopeful—I think we have to take seriously the citizenship question.

And the question arises, how is it possible that 4 million Puerto Ricans on the island, most of which are U.S. citizens—Puerto Rico is no different than any other part of the United States. Under the American flag there are X number of people who are living there who are not citizens yet—close to 4 million people never get included in the census figures as part of the national count.

Now, one could argue that this is a constitutional issue. Well, I submit to you that the Constitution in many ways is a work in progress that needs our interpretation of what the framers and the founding parents wanted it to be. In their time, there was no envisioning of American citizens living outside our territory except if

they were on travel or in the diplomatic corps or on business. But certainly there was no talk in those days about the possibility ever of granting citizenship outside the United States, if you will, and how to deal with that.

So, now we find ourselves in 1999, and since 1917 there are American citizens who don't get included in our census count. They are an addendum to our census numbers. And I don't think any American should ever be an addendum to any other American.

The irony of the situation, and the thing that has made me much more aware of the need to change this is the fact that an undocumented alien who lives in my district gets counted in the national figures but an American citizen who lives in Puerto Rico does not get included in the national figures. Now, that does not make sense at all.

And then the question to me is, when the census tells me that there are X amount of people living in my Nation, what are they talking about? Well, up to now, they've been saying X amount of people living in the 50 States. I want to change that to X amount of people living under the American flag because—understand that these are folks who are subject to every Federal law that's in place, every allocation and every rule or regulation that is in place and yet, when that family is counted, these folks become an addendum.

Now, let me be clear on one thing, Mr. Chairman. I don't know what my brother Carlos' position is on this, but, for me, the language I presented to the Appropriations Committee and the issue I have brought up since 1990 never spoke to anything having to do with the status issue. It never spoke, nor does it speak now, to distribution of funds. It cannot speak to apportioning of districts, because Puerto Rico does not have Members of Congress as such. So, it cannot speak to that at all. It doesn't speak to any allocation of funds. It speaks only to the issue of how do you not include in your family count 4 million members of the family?

I also did not include in my language other territories, although I would like to have them included, because I know that to make any one of these changes we really have to hear from the representatives from those areas. This is something that the government of Puerto Rico and its representatives are in favor of in the Puerto Rican community and that people throughout the 50 States are in favor of.

Now, we include at present the District of Columbia's population in our total count. It does not get included as an addendum and yet it is separated for purposes of reapportionment because they do not elect Members of Congress. So, we've done this already.

And so, at the expense of setting a record for the shortest presentation ever on a very serious issue, I would just like to be able from now on to say that the census reflects the count of all residents, be they citizens or not, who live under the American flag. The census should reflect the relationship under that flag, which says that these are American citizens and/or residents who are totally within our laws, totally within our behavior, totally within our rules and regulations.

How interesting that we know and include in our total figures many people from Puerto Rico at one time or another. How many people are serving in our armed forces, or at one time or another

are seeing action in battle, but we don't know or include as part of the family the total population of the island. In the future, as Mrs. Maloney said, I would like when we say there are X number of Hispanics in our country to include those who live in Puerto Rico. While I as a Puerto Rican New Yorker now say there are 4 million Puerto Ricans in Puerto Rico and close to 3 million in the 50 States, I would no longer have to make that statement. I could simply say there are close to 7 million Puerto Ricans under the American flag. And that is the way we behave from now on.

Now, as far as the data. As you know, this year the Census Bureau will be in Puerto Rico as it never has been before. The Puerto Rican Government and its representatives are doing a marvelous job getting the people involved in the census, as they have in the past. So, at the expense of sounding like I know as much as the Census Bureau, there is nothing really that has to be done differently than is being done now. All that is needed is the will to say—when we submit the figures—there will not be a line that includes other people under it, but all Americans and all people who reside next to Americans in the territories and States will be included.

For me, that is an important issue because, as we look to the future relationship of these two places, one the place where I was born and one the place where I grew up and that I represent in Congress, we have to take care of some unfinished business before we move forward. And, if in 1917 everybody in Puerto Rico was made a citizen, then we should be counted as part of the American family, and I would hope that the subcommittee sees it that way.

Thank you.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you, Mr. Serrano.

Mr. Romero-Barceló.

STATEMENT OF HON. CARLOS A. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, THE RESIDENT COMMISSIONER IN CONGRESS FROM THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Mrs. Maloney, Mr. Davis, it's a pleasure to be here today.

For the record, I want to state that my name is Carlos Romero-Barceló. I am the sole elected Representative in Congress of the United States of the 3,800,000 disenfranchised American citizens in Puerto Rico. This is part of what the problem is—and I appreciate this opportunity.

This is kind of like the chicken and the egg, which came first, because the fact that we're not included in the data then gives rise to many other discriminations. And when we say, well, why are we treated differently in Medicare even though we pay exactly the same amount that everybody else does, they say, well, we don't have the data. So, this is one of the reasons why it's so important for us to be fully included in the census, to be counted as part of the family, as Mr. Serrano says.

And, until recently, Puerto Rico and the other territories were excluded from the U.S. census totals and reports as part of the U.S. population, and this resulted in the critical undercount of Hispanics and other minorities in the Nation, with corresponding impact on the allocation of Federal resources, including even the Post

Office, even in the Coast Guard until very recently when several Members of the Congress had gotten involved because of the drug trade that was shifted from Florida to the Caribbean and particularly through Puerto Rico.

The U.S. summary reports of the census of population and housing, for instance, omit Puerto Rico and the territories. Although the same information that is collected for the 50 States is collected for Puerto Rico, it is published in a separate series of reports and is excluded from the U.S. total counts. This segregation of information has caused many of the Federal Government agencies and congressional committees that exclusively rely on the U.S. summary reports for Federal funds distribution to routinely omit Puerto Rico and the territories. The omission in return results in the arbitrary allocation of resources to Puerto Rico and is particularly felt in the most significant safety net programs, including health.

I asked many times who is responsible for the national policy that determines that the health and the lives of the U.S. citizens who reside in Puerto Rico are worth one-tenth of the health and the lives of the other U.S. citizens. The President, when I made that statement in a meeting that we had of about 200 people, he said, Carlos, what do you mean we value it at one-tenth? Because that's all we get. One-tenth in Medicaid. That means our health and the lives of the U.S. citizens of Puerto Rico, that's what they're worth. When you try to do anything in HHS, they say, well, we don't have the figures for Puerto Rico.

This is why it has become so important. If there's going to be any shift in policy then at least the facts were there, the numbers were there, the data was there. And in Medicare, for instance, we pay into it, and even though we pay into it, the benefits are not exactly the same in Medicare; and then, at the same time, the payments to the providers are completely different; and the excuses that we're being given, also the facts are not there.

So since my election in Congress, it has been my objective to ensure the American citizens in Puerto Rico receive equal access to and treatment in all the Federal programs and services, and this is one of the main barriers I ran across.

This is not a new problem. I want to point out that the national census had been administering Puerto Rico since the early 20th century, albeit with a slightly different questionnaire. When I became aware that one of the problems was the questionnaire, I met with the people in Puerto Rico, I met with the Secretary of Commerce, then Ronald Brown, and I met with people in the Bureau of the Census, and I talked to them. We analyzed this problem.

The census people from Puerto Rico came over here, the planning board people of Puerto Rico came over here to meet with census officials, and now we're finally ready to include Puerto Rico in all of the count, but then we will be separate and we will not be included in the totals, as Mr. Serrano has indicated. But I am pleased that after my continuous prodding in the meetings with the Federal officials and the OMB in the White House and this past January 6, 1999, at a meeting with Ken Prewitt, the administrator for the census, the inclusion of Puerto Rico in the national summary data products for the census 2000 was achieved.

We're very happy about this and proud of this achievement for Puerto Rico. It will mark a significant turning point in the data collection and resource allocation efforts starting with the critical census of 2000. This is a step in the right direction to ensure that the census is fully representative of the entire population, particularly the American citizens who reside in Puerto Rico and the other territories.

There is one additional issue that we are now bringing to your attention. I would like to request your support also in the future of the data collection for the Nation in the American Community Survey, or the ACS as it is commonly known, and I urge you to ensure that Puerto Rico is included in this important survey as it is implemented in the next decade.

Finally, I would like to say for us also it is important to be considered as part of the family. I think if you're excluded from the total count of the population of the United States and the U.S. citizens of Puerto Rico are not there, it's like we are an appendage. We're something separate, something different. I think that creates many, many problems from there.

And, as Mr. Serrano very ably pointed out, there's no problem as far as the distribution count and the geographical distribution and how many Representatives each State is going to have and where they're going to be distributed, because that has always been done with the District of Columbia. It has always been separated. All they have to do is subtract the number from the total and you deal with the rest of the number for that purpose. But for other purposes, it is important for us be considered as part of the Nation and not separate, at least in the data. The policies and the issues, we can deal with that separately some other time.

Thank you very much.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Carlos Romero-Barceló follows:]

CARLOS ROMERO-BARCELO
TESTIMONY BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM, SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS
SEPTEMBER 22, 1999

Chairman Miller, Ranking Member Maloney and members of the Subcommittee on the Census. For the record, I wish to state that my name is Carlos Romero-Barceló and that I am the sole elected representative to the Congress of the United States of the 3.8 million disenfranchised American citizens in Puerto Rico. I appreciate the opportunity to discuss the collection of census data for Puerto Rico and the presentation of that data with statistics for the entire nation.

Until recently, Puerto Rico and the terriritories were excluded from the U.S. Census totals and reports as part of the United States population. This has resulted in a critical undercount of Hispanics and other minorities in the nation with the corresponding impact on the allocation of Federal resources. The U.S. Summary Reports of the Census of Population and Housing, for instance, omit Puerto Rico and the territories. Although the same information collected for the 50 states is collected for Puerto Rico, it is published in a separate series of reports and is excluded from the U.S. totals count.

This segregation of information causes many of the Federal government agencies and congressional committees that exclusively rely on the U.S. Summary Reports for federal funds distribution to routinely omit Puerto Rico and the territories. The omission, in turn, results in the arbitrary allocation of resources to Puerto Rico and is particularly felt on the most significant safety net programs, including health. Some examples have included the Children's Health Initiative Program and the Medicare Reimbursement Rates for Home Health Care Providers program because Puerto Rico was not within an established census region.

Since my election to Congress it has been my objective to ensure that the American citizens in Puerto Rico receive equal access to and treatment in Federal programs and services. One of the barriers that I have faced is the lack of available statistics with respect to Puerto Rico in federal data collection efforts and their inclusion within national statistics, census products, agency surveys, government studies and other statistical analyses.

This was not a new problem. I want to point out that the national

census has been administered in Puerto Rico since early in the 20th century, albeit with a slightly different questionnaire. By ensuring that the same census questionnaire is used from Census 2000 and forward, we will make sure that data will correspond to the data collected for all other communities throughout the United States.

I am pleased that after my continuous prodding and meetings with federal officials including the Secretary of Commerce, Administrator of the Bureau of the Census, OMB and others, this past January 6, 1999, at a meeting with Ken Prewitt, Administrator for the Census, the inclusion of data from Puerto Rico in the national summary data products for Census 2000 was achieved.

I am very proud of this achievement for Puerto Rico and am convinced that it will mark a significant turning point in data collection and resource allocation efforts starting with the critical Census 2000. This is a step in the right direction to ensure that the Census is fully representative of the entire population, particularly the American citizens who reside in Puerto Rico and the other territories.

There is one additional issue I wish to bring to your attention on

which I would like to request your support. The future of data collection for the nation is the American Community Surveys or ACS as they are commonly known. I urge you to ensure that Puerto Rico is included in this important Survey as it is implemented in the next decade.

Thank you for your consideration. I would like to submit this statement for the record.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Faleomavaega.

STATEMENT OF HON. ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA, A DELEGATE IN CONGRESS FROM AMERICAN SAMOA

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We certainly appreciate your kind invitation to allow us to come and testify this morning, certainly with my distinguished colleagues, Congressman Serrano from New York and my good friend Resident Commissioner Romero-Barceló from Puerto Rico.

At the outset, Mr. Chairman, I just want to make sure there's no misunderstanding of the reason I am here. I do fully support Congressman Serrano's proposal about the inclusion of Puerto Rico in the counting process.

This is my sixth term, Mr. Chairman, here in Congress, and I find it very interesting reading through many bills and even reading through some of the laws that we have on the books, the 50 States, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia are always included but, to the rest of these areas, it's a common sea. Sometimes we're treated like foreign countries.

The irony of all this, Mr. Chairman, as Congressman Serrano stated earlier, is it all right to count for 2 million plus Puerto Rican U.S. citizens living in the 50 States, but not 1 U.S. citizen living in Puerto Rico is counted as part of that process.

For the benefit and information of the committee, despite the fact that American Samoa has had almost a 100-year relationship with the United States, it was not until 1990 that the first census count was ever made for American Samoa by the Census Bureau. How all this came about I don't know, Mr. Chairman, but I just wanted to bring that to the attention of the members of the committee.

I recall the comments made earlier by one of our former Members who represented Guam years back, a retired Brigadier General in the Marine Corps, General Ben Blaz. He made this statement, Mr. Chairman, that I always think seemed so applicable sometimes to the situation of those of us who come from the insular areas. General Blaz said, we are equal in war but not in peace.

Mr. Chairman, it's always easier to print money in terms of building equipment and hardware and bullets and all of that, but I think for the sons and daughters of the insular areas who put their life and blood on the line in defense of our Nation, that should at least count for something. I sincerely hope you will take it from that perspective.

Mr. Chairman, as Congressman Romero-Barceló explained earlier, under current procedures, the Census Bureau collects census data from the 50 States, the District of Columbia and the insular areas which include American Samoa, CNMI, Guam, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. These totals then are combined in many different ways, but the primary results are tabulated, totaled and analyzed based on, "U.S. totals," which include the 50 States and the District of Columbia, but not the insular areas, including Puerto Rico.

It's my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that part of the reason for this methodology is that the insular areas do not use the same census forms that are used in the 50 States and the District of Columbia. Over the years, the Census Bureau, in consultation with the

insular areas, has developed distinct census forms which adjust for each location's unique situation.

Our local governments have worked for years to develop forms which accurately tally meaningful data. In some cases, and in this regard I will speak only for American Samoa, the use of the standard census form in the insular areas will result in distorted data because of the cultural differences which are manifested in different familial relationships and living patterns. For example, in the United States, freehold and leasehold interests in real property are the norm, while in American Samoa the great majority of land is communally held by families and villages. The value of this communal land is not easily determined and, as a result of this distinction, census questions of the value or size of a person's land holdings or family residence will yield entirely different results in different areas.

Mr. Chairman, I'm not here to speak in opposition to efforts to include the data from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in the State and D.C. totals. Puerto Rico is many, many times larger than the rest of us combined, including many States as well; and in many respects I understand the value to Puerto Rico and to the Nation as a whole of including the data on the 3.8 million U.S. citizens who live in Puerto Rico. This is, after all, 1.5 percent of the Nation's total population and to exclude them is a distortion of data, in my humble opinion, in and of itself.

I would suggest, however, if Puerto Rico is included in the State totals that, to the extent possible, the other insular areas should also be included. I say to the extent possible, Mr. Chairman, because—and again at this point I can speak only for American Samoa—the most useful data in American Samoa is obtained from the forms derived by the joint effort of the Census Bureau and the local government. Under no circumstances would I support forcing the insular areas to use the standard census forms over local objections. I think this is where the rub comes, the problems that I'm faced with as far as representing an insular area.

Mr. Chairman, I know there are broader issues involving the subject under consideration this morning, but hopefully my discussion will convey the position of American Samoa and the narrow points I have just addressed to the members of the committee. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that this can be done in the upcoming census.

I don't think I would be the last person to submit that as you know, it's required by the Federal Constitution. Every 10 years there's to be a census taken. Not only does it have far-reaching economic and social implications—as you well know, in the 1990 census, there was an undercount of well over 5 million Americans. Unfortunately, it got to the height of political partisanship; and I sincerely hope that that won't happen in the census taken next year.

But, at any rate, I just want to thank you for letting us come and testify.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Eni Faleomavaega follows:]

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA
INCLUDING PUERTO RICO IN U.S. CENSUS RESULTS
CENSUS SUBCOMMITTEE – SEPTEMBER 22, 1999

Mr. Chairman:

Thank you for the opportunity to testify this morning on the issue of including Puerto Rico in the United States total population figures in the Census 2000.

(As Congressman Romero-Barcelo as already explained,) under current procedures, the Census Bureau collects census data from the fifty states, the District of Columbia and the insular areas, which include American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. These totals are then combined in many different ways, but the primary results are tabulated, totaled and analyzed based on the "United States" totals which include the 50 states and the District of Columbia, but not the insular areas.

It is my understanding that part of the reason for this methodology is that the insular areas do not use the same

census forms that are used in the 50 states and DC. Over the years, the Census Bureau, in consultation with the insular areas, has developed distinct census forms which adjust for each location's unique culture. Our local governments have worked for years to develop forms which accurately tally meaningful data. In some cases, and in this regard I will speak only for American Samoa, the use of the standard census form in the insular areas would result in distorted data because of cultural differences, which are manifested in different familial relationships and living patterns. For example, in the United States freehold and leasehold interests in real property are the norm, while in American Samoa the great majority of land is communally held by families and villages. The value of this communal land is not easily determined. As a result of this distinction, census questions on the value or size of a person's land holdings or family residence would yield different results in different areas.

Mr. Chairman, I am not here to speak in opposition to efforts to include data from the Commonwealth of Puerto

Rico in the State-DC totals. Puerto Rico is many, many times larger than the rest of us combined, and in many respects, I understand the value to Puerto Rico, and to the nation as a whole, in including the data on the 3.8 million U.S. citizens who live in Puerto Rico. This is, after all, 1.5% of the nation's population, and to exclude them is a distortion of data, in and of itself.

I would suggest, however, if Puerto Rico is included in the state totals, that to the extent possible, the other insular areas should also be included. I say "to the extent possible" because, and again on this point I will speak only for American Samoa, the most useful data in American Samoa is obtained from the forms derived by the joint effort of the Census Bureau and the local government. Under no circumstances would I support forcing the insular areas to use the standard census forms, over local objections.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I know there are broader issues involved in the subject under consideration this

morning, but hope my discussion will convey the position of American Samoa on the narrow points I have addressed.

Mr. MILLER. We will proceed now under the 5-minute rule.

This issue, which I became aware of when it came up during the appropriation process, sounded a little simple, but once you start delving into it there are real complications. You mentioned how we count illegals in the United States, but we don't include our total residents in Puerto Rico.

We had a meeting earlier this year concerning Americans living abroad. I don't know if you realize this, but we have several million Americans who live abroad—retired Americans, maybe working with Xerox, IBM, or something abroad. They have U.S. citizenship, they pay taxes, and they vote in this country, but they cannot be counted in the census. So, it gets very complicated and technical, the reasons why.

We'll hear from Dr. Prewitt in a few minutes about some of the things.

Part of the question that gets raised, as Dr. Prewitt I think will make in his statement, is a major policy change on statistics. I understand why there is concern here. But on the technical side, have you all had any discussions with statisticians and such?

I don't have a position at this moment, but if we did it, you are comparing apples to oranges, for example, comparing unemployment data. What do you do with something like that? Have you looked at it from position of our national statistics? It's not just unemployment but all of our statistical data.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. The same thing that was done whenever a new State was admitted to the Union, exactly the same thing. Every time a new State was admitted to the Union, they have to compare the new census with the past census. You need to make a comparison. All you need to do is make the proper adjustments. With the computers today and their programs, there's no problem to make the proper comparison, to make the proper inclusions. I don't see any real problem with that.

Mr. SERRANO. Not only that, Mr. Chairman, but every 10 years our population grows. So what I'm suggesting is that this time it grows by another 4 million in addition to whatever it grew otherwise. So the same data that you collect, the same information that you need, the same growth will take place.

Mr. Romero reminded me during the last presentation that one of the interesting points about this is that Puerto Rico, compared to the States, is larger in population than 26 or 27 States of the Union, yet those figures are not included, as I keep saying, in the American family. So, I really don't see what the problem would be.

If the census is doing the job that we know they are doing and they're capable of doing, if the American population grew by 20 million or 10 million in the last 10 years, under my plan it would grow by 14 million and those 10 million that it grew by, well, those employment or unemployment rates were not included in the last census. Their ownership of TV sets, cars, or homes, or lack thereof, was not included in the last census. Their ages were not included. Their ethnicity was not included. So, that would just be more numbers, instead of 10, 14 million.

Second, keep in mind that, in the case of Puerto Rico, and certainly the other territories, but in the case of Puerto Rico, all the questions that need to be asked are already on our census form.

There is a specific area for marking yourself down as Hispanic. There's a specific area for marking yourself down as Puerto Rican. And those who live in Puerto Rico who are either African-American or, "white Americans or Dominicans or Colombians," they're all already part of the study. So, nothing new has to be invented.

And Mr. Romero's last comment during his presentation I can't emphasize enough. He made a beautiful, as he always does, presentation not only about this issue but also for equality for Puerto Rico. But he said those policy issues can be discussed later. I think we have to be clear about what we're discussing here, including the numbers. Nothing changes, unfortunately. But nothing changes in terms of how Puerto Rico gets treated by the United States. That would take other major decisions to be made. The numbers are my concern. Living under the American flag issue is my concern.

Now, one last point on the Americans living abroad. That is an issue that we dealt with for many years, and we unfortunately haven't gotten to a solution. I don't know what the answer to that one fully is, but it's clear to me that the Puerto Rico issue is much simpler because those folks are all living under the American flag and following all American laws and subject to all American rules and regulations.

Mr. MILLER. Technically, I'm assuming the Bureau is capable of including the numbers. Of course, a giant step forward is they're going to be doing the same methodology this year and collecting the same data as in the States.

My time is up. What's your sense of how the census is doing as far as preparing for the census, awareness of the census and the ability to get a successful census in Puerto Rico?

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. It's going very well. I think the census has always done a very good job in Puerto Rico. They're prepared for it. We have a very, very organized system of outreach to get to the people because our political parties are very, very organized and we have a large proportion of the mainland registered. They have the aerial photos of the sections of all of Puerto Rico. They know where each house is. They distribute that very carefully. They're doing it every 4 years. A lot of people do it. When they get recruited for the census to do it, everybody is prepared. They know how to do it. I think the census is doing a very good job.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Faleomavaega, do you have any sense of how the census is prepared in American Samoa?

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Certainly. From this 10-year experience we've had since the 1990 census, we've gotten a lot smarter in the procedure, and certainly the Census Bureau has been very receptive and responsive to the concerns and how the data is being collected, and so we're pretty happy with the way things are proceeding right now.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you.

Mrs. Maloney.

Mrs. MALONEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

In response to the comments on counting Americans abroad, I introduced legislation that I believe the Census Bureau supports that really would require us to make sure we count in the next census Americans living abroad. It calls for a dry run between now and the next census. They should be counted.

I would like to ask the Delegates their response. And, Congressman Serrano, one option that's been discussed is for the Census Bureau to include Puerto Rico and the other territories in the U.S. totals in print and for electronic publications but make it easy for people to subtract, to include or exclude these areas from the census if need be. Does that sound like a good solution or a compromise to each of you?

Mr. SERRANO. At the expense of being dramatic, I don't like the idea of subtracting any American citizens from anything at any given time. I don't know why you would say we are counting American citizens who live under the American flag, who serve in the armed forces and die for this country, but if you want to you can subtract them. That's similar to the time that the Delegates got a vote on the House floor, something we Democrats did, and then said, however, if it determines a bill, it doesn't count—an amendment that was kind of bizarre.

Just to show you how bizarre the situation is, Mr. Romero just pointed out to me—and he's been giving me a lot of great side comments—if a Puerto Rican American citizen moves from Puerto Rico to New York, New York gains in population. But when a Texan moves to California the Nation doesn't gain in population. This is so bizarre. It should gain—here we go again—for purposes of reapportionment, right, but the American population of the United States should not go up by one because an American citizen moved from one place under the flag to the other, but yet it does under the present system. So, this exclusion thing I would not be in favor of, that we're either in or we're still out, but we shouldn't be in and on a given Tuesday morning we're out.

Mrs. MALONEY. Any other comments?

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. It depends. I don't want to differ from my colleague, but, for instance in the distribution for election purposes, there has to be a subtraction. Perhaps you have an asterisk or something, make sure this includes populations of Puerto Rico, whatever else, and then you just have to make the subtractions. The figures will be there, and you make the subtraction. At least for the distribution, election distribution, you need to make the subtraction. I have no problem with that.

Mr. SERRANO. They should do that the same way they do the District of Columbia now.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. I would like to associate myself with the comments made earlier by Mr. Serrano. I think this has always been the rub for those of us coming from the insular areas. Today we're considered U.S. citizens and equal, and then tomorrow we might look like we're aliens.

We're having a very similar problem right now in our campaign financing laws. Some Members think permanent resident aliens should not participate. I, for one, certainly support the concept. In fact, currently under the laws that we have in campaign financing, permanent resident aliens can contribute to Federal contributions. The fact is this is someone who's legally here, paying income taxes, working like anybody else, and hopefully, in the 5-year period, applying for U.S. citizenship.

Now, here's an even more interesting situation, where here again some of the quirks of the law is that we're not U.S. citizens but

we're U.S. nationals. Under the current immigration laws specifically, and I can memorize this thing practically, a U.S. national is someone who owes permanent allegiance to the United States but who is neither a citizen nor an alien. Figure that out.

Mrs. MALONEY. The census questionnaire for Puerto Rico is the same as that used in the rest of the United States; is that correct?

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. For this year, for the first time, it will be. That's because we got together with the census and made the agreement. Apparently, there was a difference, as Mr. Faleomavaega had indicated, for all the territories.

Mrs. MALONEY. Then I understand, for the territories, the questionnaire is somewhat different, and Mr. Faleomavaega mentioned it, that communal property was one example of how it was different.

I'd like you to elaborate in other ways how the census form might be different, and I'd like to know whether you think your government should conduct the census or the Census Bureau should conduct the census and why do you believe that the form that you use should be different from the census form used by everyone else.

And I'd like the Delegates please to share with us the experiences you've had with your government in working with the Census Bureau to develop the 2000 census. Have they been responsive? Have they worked with you? Describe some of the interactions that you might have had.

And could you elaborate a little more on how the census data is used in your territory?

And, again, I just thank you for coming.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. If I could just say very briefly, if we're making such an effort to find out how many illegal aliens are in our country, the least we can do as a government is find out how many U.S. nationals, how many U.S. citizens we have in this government. It seems to me that that's the bottom line, in my humble opinion.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. As far as I know, the government at home is working very closely with the Census Bureau, and we have had no problems. We've been in touch. We've talked several times throughout the year, and they never complained to me about any problems at all with the Census Bureau. Everything seems to be working all right. We changed the form, and I think there was no real valid reason for having different questionnaires in Puerto Rico, and we feel if that was an obstacle, that's been removed.

Mrs. MALONEY. I tell you, Mr. Chairman, possibly we should have a field hearing in Puerto Rico, especially in January. I think it would be very important to go and see exactly how the field offices are working.

Mr. Serrano, I would love it if you could arrange for at least 2 or 3 million citizens to move to New York for purposes of the count for New York City for distribution of aid and all that.

Mr. SERRANO. I understand Mr. Romero wants them to stay there in anticipation of something else for himself.

Let me just say that I'm a big, big supporter of the Census Bureau. I think they're doing a fabulous job. I've always said they're professionals who know what they're doing, should be given all the

support—criticism when it's necessary—but all the support, and left alone to do this job. And I think that they will handle the count properly throughout this country. And if given the extra responsibility, they're going to handle the census count in Puerto Rico. All they have to do is add the numbers. The computer can do that in half an hour.

Let me just close this comment by saying to you that, again, I can't overemphasize how dramatic this issue is. I'm a Member of Congress. There is no greater proof, I guess, of citizenship. The Constitution is clear that you have to be a citizen to be a Member of Congress. And yet, if I retire from Congress and move to Puerto Rico, I no longer get counted in the census any longer. Now, my citizenship just sort of dropped off the side of a table by moving there. At least as I envision my retirement, let me get counted wherever I go.

Mrs. MALONEY. I'd just like to note that Congressman Ford has joined us, another member of the committee.

Mr. FORD. I'll be there in Puerto Rico if you want to hold a hearing.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Chairman, definitely, no way would I ever want to compare the numbers with my good friends here from Puerto Rico, but I do personally invite all of you to come to American Samoa.

Now, I know with the last count there was supposed to be 120,000 members of my tribe living in California, but you talk about being undercounted. The last Census Bureau count was only 30,000. Now, according to our numbers, we have currently about 20 Samoans that currently play in the NFL, and I think that maybe this is probably our best export in the coming years. But I do want to thank the chairman and the Members for allowing us to come and testify.

Mrs. MALONEY. I want to thank the Members for their insights and passion and commitment and particularly for their strong words supporting the professionals at the Census Bureau to get the best count possible. That's important not only with the dollars that Mr. Serrano and Mr. Miller worked on, but really supporting their independence and moving forward to get an accurate count. Thank you.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Davis.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

As I listen to the discussion and as I try to understand the issue, it seems to me when people think of census-taking and when they think of individuals being missed, the first thing you think of is apportionment. That is, you think of political representation and the ability to be represented and the possibility of being represented. And I'm hearing that what we're talking about really would not affect in any way that line of thought or that process.

Then people think of resource allocation. They think of a direct relationship between the numbers of people, their socioeconomic characteristics and the ability to receive resources from their Federal Government.

And I was just thinking, when Moses started taking the census, what resources were they going to distribute, or were they going to divide the manna up from heaven in some other way? Which

really takes me to my question and the issues that I've heard many people express in terms of any concerns that they would have.

If we move to the point of counting the individuals in Puerto Rico and in some of the other territories the very same way, would this in any way skew the distribution of resources differently than what currently exists, even to the extent of having socioeconomic data that may cause planning to be done with more information or with different information that may put resources into categories or areas of concentration differently?

And so it seems to me there is a purpose that sometimes people don't look at, and that's the purpose of the need to know. That is information generated based upon the concept of the need to know. Because I don't think Moses was elected by anybody. I don't think he was. If he was, I didn't hear about it, and I'm not sure that they had Medicaid and Medicare. Didn't seem to me that they had day care and Head Start. So would this change in any way or skew in any way the allocation of resources?

Mr. SERRANO. This discussion has been going on in Puerto Rico for years, way before I was in politics, but as a person who first originated some language to include somewhere and brought up the issue, I've always understood that the relationship between Puerto Rico and the United States gets settled in different forums within this House. It does not get settled in a census count.

Let me be clear on that. Nothing that I have proposed changes in any way because it can't under census rules. Census rules can't change the distribution of funds to Puerto Rico.

What I'm after, first of all, and then I'll quickly answer your question, is a matter of what is fair, what is right and what is correct in what the count of people who live under the American flag is; and I think I've made that clear.

But I don't think it would hurt if you also knew that living under the American flag are people who lived under a certain index of poverty. I don't think it would hurt us to know if people living under the American flag have a certain number of high school graduates or high school dropouts or doctors or lawyers graduating locally. What's interesting about it is no one should panic at the thought of setting off a chain of events by including these numbers in the American family. In past years, but starting this year in a very official way, data will be collected anyway in Puerto Rico and that data will be looked at by people in different parts of the country as they look at the whole American picture.

My whole point continues to be, as simply as I can put it: Don't exclude American citizens from being counted.

Then this conversation continues, Mr. Davis, on a daily basis. How should we treat our territories? How should I stand clear on this? I have always felt American citizens should be treated equally, but this doesn't speak to that. That's another discussion in another forum. This speaks about including these numbers properly. I repeat for the last time, though, if that information is available, there's nothing wrong with having that information because we should know at all times how people live under the American flag and under what conditions.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. I would like to add something to what Mr. Serrano said.

There are two parts to this. What Mr. Serrano is trying to get through with this amendment is merely to have the figures collected in Puerto Rico included in the totals of the Nation so that we're counted as part of the Nation. And the figures for Puerto Rico now will be collected separately and will be made part of the census and all 50 States will be there, and Puerto Rico will be at the end. All the figures will be collected.

Those figures on that side, that decision has already been made. They will not provide for any policy change, but they will provide the facts and the data if there is to be a policy change in regards to distribution of funds. Then, the facts will be there.

Now, if we want to get a policy change on a distribution of funds, one of the first things that the policymaker shows, we don't have the figures in Puerto Rico. We don't have the facts. So, they're building an obstacle that prevents them from making any change in policy. That's why I said, like the story, which came before, the chicken or the egg? Because when you try to make a change, the big excuse is that the facts are not there. I think we should remove that excuse from the table and then just deal with the policy issue.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, if I may add something very quickly to that?

Our language doesn't change. The census already decided that they're going to take this count in Puerto Rico so the policy change could come with those figures regardless of whether you're involved in the American family or not.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. I think, Mr. Davis, I appreciate your question. In my limited reading of the good book, Moses was a great prophet, but he was a poor administrator, so he had to depend on his father-in-law, Jethro, to tell him how to administer the kingdom. But I think, in line with what Congressman Serrano and Mr. Barceló stated, the fact of the matter is these figures, these statistics, do not exist and how is the Congress ever going to better address the issues?

You know, the thing that really bugs me is that walking down Independence or even down Pennsylvania Avenue, we have our fellow Americans sleeping on the streets, begging for food and to think that this is the most powerful and the most prosperous Nation in the world, and we have this existing right in our own backyard. It's the same thing that I would feel as coming from an insular area. I feel like we're in the backyards, feel like we're not being counted, feel like we're not being included as part of the process. I could not agree more with what my friend Congressman Serrano and Resident Commissioner Barceló have stated.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you very much.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Ford.

Mr. FORD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My colleague, Mr. Romero-Barceló, really answered my question with his last response. That's really the only question I had. Always delighted to be with my colleague, Congressman Serrano. I want to make sure I stay on his good side. As I ponder a Senate race, I want to make sure I keep Mr. Serrano on my side.

Mr. SERRANO. You're doing a great job with that.

Mr. FORD. I yield to Mrs. Maloney.

Mrs. MALONEY. My good friend Eni and Mr. Davis raised Moses. If I remember, Moses traveled through the desert for 40 years because he didn't have a plan. So, what we really need to do is see how this plan fits into the plan so that we do get an accurate and good census.

I just have one last question, and it was sparked by the comment of Mr. Serrano at the beginning. He said there's a citizenship question and there is a status question and the citizenship question should be separate from the status question. Could you clarify for me where are we going with the status question? I know there was a vote. Is there another vote coming up? And if Mr. Faleomavaega would like to clarify the status question, also. But that's my last question.

Mr. SERRANO. Let me just respond briefly on that.

I believe that the status question is a serious question which has to be settled and leads to all other issues. I have been very clear that independence and Statehood are very acceptable to me as dignified options but that the Commonwealth status is a second-, third-, fourth-, fifth-class citizenship that is unacceptable to me. I'll give you reasons.

If you and I now move to Puerto Rico, we'd have a wonderful time, but I can no longer vote for a President. I can no longer vote for a Member of Congress. I can no longer get any representation properly. On the other hand, we're not an independent nation that can set its course throughout the world. So, how you feel about that, that's one issue.

There has never been—and this is the solution to me—there has never been an option presented by the government that holds the colony, the U.S. Government, our Congress, saying here it is. You choose this or you choose that. And either say I will give you what you choose or at least say by a certain date, as the Young bill said and why I supported it, by a certain date I will take up the option you pass so that you know where you stand with us.

This is totally my personal view that we should include options that end the colony. Either integration into the family or separation from the family, but it should not include any more colonial.

Let me close with this. On some other issues we've been discussing recently, I've been saying for people like me, we look at the United States, in my case, as my father and Puerto Rico as my mother and for over 100 years, my father has held my mother in a very unfair relationship. I think it's time for him, for my father, to either legitimize the relationship or to let my mother go, but this continued bondage in some way is totally improper and should end.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. With respect to when we're going to have a vote, I think there's a consensus in Puerto Rico that we should try to get a bill through the House and the Senate sponsoring the referendum in Puerto Rico because then we will be able to say this is what Congress is willing to accept, willing to grant the people of Puerto Rico. We've had too many privately state on their own, where people are willing to say, well, we asked for it; what's going to happen? And the opposition always said, if Puerto Rico asks for Statehood, it's not going to be granted because there's a lot of prejudice in the Nation. That's how the opposition tries to beat down

Statehood, and people are afraid to ask for something that will be denied because they're too proud. So unless and until Congress makes the statement clear, I think we will not have a real, valid referendum. But as soon as that happens, we'll have one, that's for sure.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. One of the unique features of being classified as a U.S. territory, if I may—for example, in American Samoa, American Samoa is an unincorporated and unorganized territory of the United States. But I say that Mrs. Maloney in a certain perspective, as my good friend Mr. Davis had raised the issue of Moses the prophet. Well, when you think back to one of the greatest empires that ever existed, the Roman empire, one of the things most unique in the new testament—as I recall, reading about Paul, the Apostle, was that he was Jewish by ancestry, but he was a Roman citizen, which afforded him all the privileges allotted to anybody who lives under the Roman empire.

So, I kind of like to think, for those of us living in the insular areas, even though we may call it a province—we don't like the word colonialism because we were a colony of the British empire—we are part of the American family. And if I were a U.S. citizen, I don't care where I live, I should be granted the same privileges and immunities whether you live in Timbuktu, Africa, or wherever. We should be extended the same privileges of a U.S. citizen, which, by the way, is probably the most sought-after citizenship in any place in this planet.

Thank you.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you.

Let me thank all three of our colleagues for being with us today and bringing this important issue before us. Thank you all for being here, and we'll proceed on with Dr. Prewitt, our next panel. Thank you.

Dr. Prewitt, as is procedure within the Government Reform Committee, would you raise your right hand?

[Witness sworn.]

Mr. MILLER. The record will reflect Dr. Prewitt said I do.

The presentation by the three Members of Congress, that raises a very important issue, but it has some very significant implications of a change, of historic proportion, and so we're very interested in the Bureau's thoughts on that and also the thoughts within the statistical community, even though you're the only one here right now on that.

Dr. Prewitt.

STATEMENT OF KENNETH PREWITT, DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Dr. PREWITT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity. I would like to preface it by expressing my very strong appreciation for the very strong words that you and Mrs. Maloney and Congressman Serrano have put on the table with respect to the importance of a continuing resolution that allows us to maintain the momentum as we move into October 1. That's very seriously appreciated work and effort on your behalf. Thank you.

I'm going to have behind me Ms. Teresa Angueira, who is the Assistant Division Chief for our Decennial Management Division and

is in charge of planning for census 2000 in Puerto Rico; and, if there are particular technical questions, I may wish to call upon her for answers as well.

As has already been clear, Puerto Rico has been included in every decennial census since 1910. Title 13 of the U.S. Code, which sets out the basic law under which we conduct the census, specifies that, in addition to the 50 States and the District of Columbia, the census should include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, the Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands and such other possessions and areas over which the United States exercises jurisdiction, control or sovereignty.

Our census plans in Puerto Rico, as you just heard, are moving along on schedule. I was able to visit Puerto Rico in early August at which time I had an informative luncheon with Congressman Romero-Barceló. I also met with him earlier on some of these issues. I met with the Governor, Governor Rossello, and participated in an important census 2000 town hall meeting of mayors, government officials, and data users.

Of course, I have had exchanges with Representative Serrano about the need for a complete and accurate census in Puerto Rico and, of course, also in New York.

The essential thing to remember about census 2000 operations for Puerto Rico is that they will be comparable to the States. We will conduct a full range of operations to ensure a complete and accurate enumeration.

I'm going to address, first, the issue of tabulations raised in your letter of invitation and in the report language proposed by Representative Serrano. The report language states that the committee expects the Census Bureau to include Puerto Rico in any electronic access to census data as a State equivalent in the same manner as the District of Columbia is included. It also suggests that any extracts of census data, like the 1990 Public-Use Microdata sample, should treat Puerto Rico in the same manner as the District of Columbia.

Electronic access to 2000 data will be through a newly developed system called the American FactFinder. This system is available now on the Census Bureau's Internet home page. Not only will Puerto Rico be treated as a State equivalent, we are developing a special Spanish-language interface for Puerto Rico. As for Public-Use Microdata samples, we did have comparable samples from Puerto Rico in 1990 and would expect to do so again in 2000.

Report language also says that the committee expects the Census Bureau to include Puerto Rico in any national totals in these national summary data products.

The issue of including Puerto Rico in the national counts would differ from what we announced in Census 2000 Decision Memorandum No. 64. This memo, issued in November 1998, indicates that the Census Bureau will include data for Puerto Rico in the national summary data products for census 2000. That is, unlike 1990 when data for Puerto Rico were included only in one national summary table showing total population, the data from census 2000 will display Puerto Rico in every national summary report.

The best way to understand the difference between the decision memorandum and the report language is to compare 1990 with the

plan for 2000 and then the plan for 2000 with illustrative tabulations responsive to the report language.

Members of the committee, if I could draw your attention to the appendices, the attachments at the end of my written testimony, because I will now make reference to those.

I refer first to attachment 1, which has two pages. The first page shows national summary totals for certain characteristics data as presented in 1990. There is no line for Puerto Rico on this page. Compare this with the second page of attachment 1, which illustrates the current 2000 plan. On this page you will see a separate line for Puerto Rico at the bottom. We will display Puerto Rico counts on all national summary tables that report population and housing characteristics.

This is a full-table coverage effort and is a significant improvement in presentation of data for Puerto Rico compared to 1990. I want to emphasize on any table in which you can find data for the District of Columbia or for Florida or for New York or for Illinois, you will also find data for Puerto Rico. This table does not address but then does not preclude the issue that the report language introduces, which is including Puerto Rico counts in the national totals.

So, let me now turn to that issue and to attachment 2. Attachment 2 helps us see what we believe would be required by the report language that Puerto Rico counts be included in the national totals. Page 1 of that attachment shows from 1990 the only table produced where totals for Puerto Rico were included on the same page as those for the United States, as traditionally defined. You will see a line at the top that says total. This is the total population count for all areas and groups covered in the 1990 census including, of course, Puerto Rico.

Below that is a line "United States" and then separate totals for each outlying area and the three categories of the U.S. population abroad. This is how we presented the data in 1990. Mr. Chairman, for purposes of this testimony, I interpret the line "United States" and not the line "Total" to be equivalent to the term national totals used in the report language.

The remainder of my testimony will not be responsive to your questions 1 and 6 in the letter of invitation if this misinterprets the report language. So, I pause to make sure I've interpreted the report language because the report language uses the term national totals, but I do think that what Mr. Serrano has in mind is equivalent to what we in this table call "United States." What we in this table call "Total" already includes Puerto Rico.

Mr. MILLER. I believe that's right.

Dr. PREWITT. Thank you.

Then let me direct your attention to page 2. This page reconfigures the 1990 table to follow our interpretation of the proposed report language. As you can see, we no longer have a separate line for Puerto Rico under outlying areas. And the 1990 U.S. total, instead of being 248.7 is now 252.2 because it includes Puerto Rico's population. Had we presented the 1990 counts in this manner for the last 9 years, every ratio, proportion or other statistic in the country that takes the U.S. population as its denominator would have been different.

Under Decision Memorandum No. 64, it is the Census Bureau's plan to include Puerto Rico in national summary data products, as illustrated in attachment 1, but not in national totals.

Though it is not our present intent, it is feasible to include Puerto Rico in the national totals. This decision, however, would have to be made prior to April 30, 2000, in order to incorporate it into our tabulation planning process. After that date, it would be difficult to implement a change from our present plans for the census 2000 tabulation.

I hope that my testimony to this point answers the questions about tabulation posed for this hearing. However, I would also like to take a few minutes to explain the logic behind Decision Memorandum No. 64.

The Census Bureau and other Federal statistical agencies historically have defined the "U.S. total" as the aggregate of the States and the District of Columbia. The Census Bureau would not normally deviate from historic practice in such a major way without prior and thorough consultation with relevant stakeholders, including other members of the statistical system.

To tabulate Puerto Rico in the U.S. total for the 2000 census would introduce a statistical redefinition of the United States. There are many consequences to be considered.

First, let me refer you back to attachment 2 where the first page, as I said, is a 1990 census table that displays not just population but also land and water area. In the mock-up of this table, page 2 of the attachment, we have included Puerto Rico's area measurements as well as its population in the U.S. total. The Census Bureau is unsure whether that is the intention of the proposed report language. If not, the population measures and the area measures would have inconsistent denominators as the area measure would be for the United States and District of Columbia, whereas the population measure would be based upon populations of the States, District of Columbia and Puerto Rico. So, we would have inconsistent denominators.

If it is the intent of the report language, however, then every measure of population density, which itself is a denominator for other statistical uses, would change compared to 1990.

This is but one of many examples as to how Census Bureau products would be affected.

There are also far-reaching consequences of data comparability with products from other Federal statistical programs. Different statistical definitions of the United States from one agency to another would affect comparability in all of our statistics: demographic, economic, health, education, agricultural, justice, and so forth. For example, a recently released Bureau of Labor Statistics report on Employment and Average Annual Pay for Large Counties, 1997, includes data from San Juan, Puerto Rico. The tabular presentation includes a line called "United States," and the Bureau of Labor Statistics is careful to note, "calculations for the United States do not include data from Puerto Rico," which is to say the Bureau of Labor Statistics has taken a position consistent with Decision Memorandum 64, which is to include data from Puerto Rico but not to make it part of the national total.

For reasons of statistical consistency, the Census Bureau would hesitate unilaterally to establish a new denominator. A statistical system requires common definitions if it is to be a system. There are few definitions more basic than what constitutes the national total population. Any fundamental change in this definition should be fully explored with stakeholders within and outside the Federal Government.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it is the recommendation of the Census Bureau that the policies set forth in Decision Memorandum No. 64, which will result in Puerto Rico being shown in all census 2000 national summary tables of population and housing characteristics but not included in the national totals, be controlling pending broad consultation and more intensive review of the implications of altering the basic denominator for nearly every statistic generated over the next decade.

Mr. Chairman, I've used up most of my time discussing the tabulation issue because I judge it to be the priority question for this hearing.

I will very briefly reference my written testimony on questions two or three of your invitation letter which focus on census procedure for Puerto Rico. I'm very pleased that the previous panel spoke so favorably about the current plans. We are indeed on schedule in Puerto Rico. As you have already heard, we are providing for the Puerto Rico census a questionnaire form which is nearly identical—not completely, but nearly identical to the Stateside. This questionnaire for Puerto Rico was not submitted to the Congress because that's not our obligation, but it was approved by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget.

The basic census procedure in Puerto Rico will be update leave, that is, enumerators will deliver the questionnaire and update the address file. In constructing the address file, the address file for Puerto Rico, we've had active involvement in our LUCA program. One major difference for Puerto Rico compared to 1990 is that in 2000 they will be able to mail back the questionnaire. We will have a nonresponse followup procedure that is similar to what we use Stateside.

We have all of our coverage improvement strategies in place to check the quality of our work and reach our goal of accounting for 100 percent of the policy. We will conduct the accuracy and coverage evaluation survey.

As has already been made clear, Puerto Rico is actively involved in our outreach effort. We've mailed materials to 80 municipalities to encourage them to form complete count committees.

As in the States, a program in which you've taken a keen interest, we have a very active census in the schools program. In partnership with the Department of Education, school kits will be made available to every teacher in Puerto Rico.

We are partnering with community groups and professional associations. We partnered with the Museum of Art of Puerto Rico, which permitted reproduction of a poster which we have displayed here in the hearing room. We're very proud of that poster, and it's now being very widely used around Puerto Rico.

With respect to paid advertising, we have Y & R Puerto Rico, which has very nearly completed production of what we believe will be a very successful campaign.

We are committed to a strong, high-quality census in Puerto Rico and believe we're on track to do so.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you, Dr. Prewitt.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Prewitt follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF

KENNETH PREWITT

DIRECTOR, U. S. BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Before the Subcommittee on the Census

Committee on Government Reform

U. S. House of Representatives

September 22, 1999

Mr. Chairman, Mrs. Maloney, and members of the Committee:

Thank you for this opportunity to testify today on plans for Census 2000 in Puerto Rico. I want to introduce Ms. Teresa Angueira, who is Assistant Division Chief in our Decennial Management Division and is in charge of planning for Census 2000 in Puerto Rico. I may be calling on Ms. Angueira for technical answers during the questioning.

Puerto Rico has been included in every decennial census since 1910; the U.S. government also conducted a special census in Puerto Rico in 1899. Title 13 of the U.S. Code, which sets out the basic law under which we conduct the census, specifies that in addition to the 50 states and the District of Columbia, the census should include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and "such other possessions and areas over which the United States exercises jurisdiction, control, or sovereignty."

Census 2000 plans are well along, and on schedule. I was honored to have the opportunity to visit Puerto Rico in early August, at which time I had a luncheon meeting with Representative Carlos Romero-Barceló, met with Governor Pedro Rosselló and participated in an important Census 2000 Town Hall meeting of mayors, government officials, and data users.

The essential thing to remember about Census 2000 operations for Puerto Rico is that they will be comparable to those in the states. We will conduct the full range of operations to ensure a

complete and accurate enumeration, tailoring them as necessary, in consultation with our partners in Puerto Rico, to meet local needs.

TABULATIONS

Mr. Chairman, I will first address the issues concerning tabulations raised in your letter of invitation and in the Report language proposed by Representative José Serrano.

To cite the Report language:

> *"The Committee also expects the Census Bureau to include Puerto Rico in any electronic access to census data as a 'state equivalent' in the same manner as the District of Columbia is included. Similarly, any extracts of census data like the 1990 Public-Use Microdata Sample should treat Puerto Rico in the same manner as the District of Columbia."*

Electronic access to Census 2000 data will be through a newly developed system called the American FactFinder. This system is available now on the Census Bureau's Internet homepage. Not only will Puerto Rico be treated as a 'state equivalent,' we are developing a special Spanish-language "interface" for Puerto Rico. As for Public-Use Microdata Samples, we did have comparable samples for Puerto Rico in 1990 and would expect to again in 2000. But I should caution that tabulation plans are not final, and we do not yet have details about the microdata samples, for the 50 states, for the District of Columbia or for Puerto Rico. We have every expectation of treating Puerto Rico in the same manner as the District of Columbia.

To further cite the Report language:

> *"The Committee expects the Census Bureau to include Puerto Rico in any national totals in these national summary data products."*

The issue of including Puerto Rico in the "national totals" would differ from what we announced in Census 2000 Decision Memorandum No. 64. The Decision Memorandum, issued in November 1998, stated that we would include data for Puerto Rico in the national summary data products for Census 2000. This was in keeping with my response to a letter from Representative Romero-Barceló also in November 1998 and to a commitment made in May 1996 by then Secretary of Commerce Mickey Kantor to Governor Rosselló. This means that, unlike 1990 when data for Puerto Rico were included only in one national summary table showing total population, in 2000 census data for Puerto Rico will be included in every national summary report, including those presenting data on population and housing characteristics.

The best way to understand the difference between the Decision Memorandum and the Report language is to compare 1990 with the plan for 2000, and then the plan for 2000 with illustrative tabulations responsive to the Report language.

I refer first to Attachment 1 of my written statement, which has two pages. The first page shows national summary totals for certain characteristics data as presented in 1990. There is no line for Puerto Rico on this page. Compare this with the second page of Attachment 1, which illustrates the plan for 2000 as set forth in Decision Memorandum No. 64. On this page you will see a separate line for Puerto Rico. This is the current plan: to display Puerto Rico counts on all national summary tables which report population and housing characteristics. The plan does not preclude the inclusion of Puerto Rico counts in the "national totals."

Attachment 2, which also has two pages, displays what we believe would be required by the Report language that Puerto Rico counts be included in "national totals." Page 1 of this attachment shows the only table produced for the 1990 Census where totals for Puerto Rico were included on the same page as those for the United States, as traditionally defined. You will see a line at the top that says "Total." This is the total population count for all areas and groups covered in the 1990 Census, including, of course, Puerto Rico. Below that is a line indicating "United States" and then separate totals for each Outlying Area and three categories of U.S. population abroad. For purposes of this testimony I interpret the line "United States" and not the line "Total" to be equivalent to the term "national totals" used in the Report language.

Page 2 of the attachment reconfigures the 1990 table to follow the proposed Report language. As you can see, we no longer have a separate line for Puerto Rico under Outlying Areas. And the 1990 U.S. total, instead of being 248.7 million is now 252.2 million because it includes Puerto Rico's population. Had we presented the 1990 counts in this manner, for the last nine years every ratio, proportion, or other statistic in the country that takes the total U. S. population as its denominator would have been different.

Under Decision Memorandum No. 64, it is the Census Bureau's plan to include Puerto Rico in national summary data products, but not in "national totals."

Though it is not our present intent, it is feasible to include Puerto Rico in the national totals. The decision, however, would have to be made prior to April 30, 2000, in order to incorporate it into our tabulation planning process. After that date it would be difficult to implement a change from our present plans for the Census 2000 tabulation.

I hope that my testimony to this point answers the questions about tabulation posed for this hearing. I would also like to take a few minutes to explain the logic behind Decision Memorandum No. 64.

The Census Bureau and other federal statistical agencies historically have defined the "United States total" as the aggregate of the states and the District of Columbia. The Census Bureau would not normally deviate from historic practice in such a major way without prior and thorough consultation with relevant stakeholders, including other members of the statistical system.

To tabulate Puerto Rico in the "United States" total for the 2000 census would introduce a statistical redefinition of the United States. There are many consequences to be considered. For example, let me refer you back to Attachment 2, where the first page is a 1990 census table that displays land and water area as well as population. In the mockup of this table, page 2 of the Attachment, we have included Puerto Rico's area measurements as well as its population in the "United States" line. The Census Bureau is unsure whether that is the intention of the proposed Report language. If not, the population measures and the area measures would have inconsistent denominators. If it is the intent, every measure of population density, which itself is a denominator for other statistical uses, would change compared to 1990.

This is an example of how Census Bureau products could be affected. There also are far-reaching consequences of data compatibility with products from other Federal statistical programs. Different statistical definitions of the "United States" from one agency to another would affect comparability in all of our statistics -- demographic, economic, health, education, agricultural, justice, etc. For example, a recently released Bureau of Labor Statistics report on "Employment and Average Annual Pay for Large Counties, 1997" includes data for San Juan, Puerto Rico. The tabular presentation also includes a line labeled "United States" and the BLS is careful to note, and I quote, "Calculations for the United States do not include data from Puerto Rico."

For reasons of statistical consistency, the Census Bureau would hesitate unilaterally to establish a new denominator. A statistical system requires common definitions if it is to be a "system." There are few definitions more basic than what constitutes the national total population. Any fundamental change in this definition should be fully explored with stakeholders within and outside the federal government.

It is the recommendation of the Census Bureau that the policy set forth in Decision Memorandum No. 64 -- which will result in Puerto Rico being shown in all Census 2000 national summary tables of population and housing characteristics, but not included in the "national totals" -- be controlling pending broad consultation and more intensive review of the implications of altering the basic denominator for nearly every statistic generated over the next decade.

PROCEDURES FOR PUERTO RICO

I next want to briefly describe how we will conduct Census 2000 in Puerto Rico, with references to major differences from the 1990 census. This will respond to issues 2 and 3 in your letter of invitation.

Questionnaire Content

In past censuses, the questionnaires (short and long form) for Puerto Rico have been similar to those in the states, but with differences in keeping with local needs and conditions. For example,

in 1990, the stateside questionnaires, but not those for Puerto Rico, contained questions on race and Hispanic origin. In October 1997, the Planning Board, on behalf of the Population and Housing Interagency Committee that it chaired, requested that the questionnaire content for Puerto Rico be the same as that of the 50 states. We have accepted that recommendation with only minor modifications required in a few questions and response categories on the long form.

As required by Title 13, on March 30 of last year, the Census Bureau informed the U.S. Congress of the planned questions for Census 2000. Title 13 requires that we tell the Congress 2 years before Census Day, the exact questions that we plan to ask. As we reported to the Congress, Census 2000 will include two questionnaires: a short form and a long form. The short form will contain a core set of seven questions that will be asked of the entire population and about every housing unit. The long form will include both the core set of questions and 45 additional questions that will be asked of a sample of the population and housing units. The short form will be delivered to 5 out of every 6 housing units, and the long form will be delivered to about 1 out of every 6 of the Puerto Rico's housing units. While the questionnaires for Puerto Rico did not have to be submitted to Congress, they were approved by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget, which approves all Federal data collections. The contracts for printing questionnaires have been awarded and printing has begun.

Using the findings from our census testing and research, we are designing user-friendly questionnaires that are simpler and easier for respondents to understand and complete. Forms will be available in both Spanish and English. As I will explain later, questionnaires will be delivered to each housing unit by census takers and the householders will be asked to respond in the mail. Multiple contacts will be made with each housing unit through alert and reminder postcards that will be sent before and after the questionnaires. Additionally, census questionnaires and other forms will be available to any respondents who did not receive one at their residence. They will be placed at walk-in assistance centers and other convenient places that people frequent. Householders can also respond by telephone if they choose.

Data Collection

With regard to data collection, the biggest difference between Census 2000 and previous censuses is that for the first time residents of Puerto Rico will be allowed to respond by mail. In previous censuses, the Census Bureau sent census takers to each housing unit to conduct a personal interview. For Census 2000, in March of next year, we will send census takers to each housing unit to update the census address list and to leave a questionnaire. We will ask householders to fill out the questionnaire and mail it back to the census office for their area. We will follow up on every housing unit for which we do not receive a questionnaire to complete the enumeration. We have tested this method in the United States and have used it for the last several censuses. It will allow us to conduct a more accurate and cost-effective population count for Puerto Rico.

The increase in limited-access communities and a population that mirrors stateside in the prevalence of two-income working families made it imperative that the Census Bureau

implement a new data collection method. The new procedures will improve coverage as we will "cover the ground" more than once and it will also allow us to build an address list for future census efforts. Another benefit is that the new procedures allow for self-response. Census Bureau studies have shown that self-response results in higher quality data than that obtained through enumerator interviews.

In order to conduct a census by mail, we must first create a master list of all residential addresses/location descriptions in Puerto Rico. In February 1998, we opened the Puerto Rico area office in San Juan. Between June and October 1998, we opened about 24 small census field offices to complete address listing work. The address listing was completed between October 1998 and January 1999. This summer, as part of the Local Update of Census Addresses (LUCA), we gave listings to municipio officials for review. This is a new program mandated by the Congress that was not available last time. The review period for the LUCA concluded in early July. This fall, we give the municipio officials the results of the recanvass work done to check any discrepancies noted. We have closed the address listing offices, but this summer, we opened 9 local census offices to conduct data collection operations next year. These offices have hired management staff.

Accuracy and Coverage Evaluation

To check the quality of our work and to reach our goal of accounting for 100 percent of the population, we will take a second independent sample of housing units in the states as well as in Puerto Rico. This is the Accuracy and Coverage Evaluation survey. We will check the results from the mail-in, from telephone interviews, and from the personal visits. This quality check will, for the first time, correct for the undercount and lead to a census that reflects the total population of Puerto Rico.

Partnerships

Finally, I want to mention the importance of building partnerships to ensure a successful census. The Census Bureau cannot accomplish its goals alone. It needs to reach out early and consistently to find "best in class" partners to help it accomplish its objectives.

As we have for each census since 1960, we are working jointly with the Puerto Rico Planning Board in an effort to make Census 2000 an accurate census that collects the data Puerto Rico will need for the first decade of the 21st century. In February 1998, the Honorable Norma Burgos, then Chairwoman of the Planning Board, finalized the Memorandum of Agreement, which had earlier been signed by then Director of the U.S. Census Bureau Martha Farnsworth Riche. The Memorandum of Agreement amends the original 1958 Agreement between the two parties and lays out our respective roles and responsibilities. The Memorandum of Agreement was preceded by several years of joint efforts between the Planning Board and the Census Bureau and these efforts continue.

As our census partner, the Planning Board also helps by disseminating data as lead agency for the Census Data Center Program, providing technical assistance to the municipios, and

coordinating municipio participation in geographic programs.

Municipio governments know the local conditions and circumstances. They helped us correct our maps and address list, such as in the LUCA program I mentioned earlier, and will tell us where to place questionnaire assistance centers. They can alert us to problems and advise us of opportunities to publicize Census 2000. They can also play a big role in encouraging participation in the census. We have mailed materials to the nearly 80 municipios encouraging them to form complete count committees. As in the states, we will implement a Census in the Schools program, specifically tailored to Puerto Rico, and, with the partnership of the Puerto Rico Department of Education, school kits will be made available to every teacher, which is an expansion over 1990. I particularly want to mention the contribution of the Secretary of Education, Victor Fajardo, who is also a member of the Census 2000 Race and Ethnic Advisory Committee on Hispanic Populations.

We are also partnering with community groups and professional associations who know their constituents better than either the Census Bureau or any other governmental office. The groups can alert us to the best ways to communicate with their constituents to ensure they are counted and that the data collected meet the needs of Puerto Rico data users.

We partnered with the Museo de Arte de Puerto Rico, which permitted reproduction of Manuel Hernández Acevedo's painting "Plaza San José" for use in a poster that is being widely distributed for use in Puerto Rico.

And we will use private companies to manage our efforts to promote Census 2000 more visibly and effectively. For the first time, we will use paid advertising to promote participation--both in the states and in Puerto Rico. An advertising and promotion campaign designed to build awareness of the census and boost participation will be developed for Puerto Rico that will take into account its specific needs. Y & R Puerto Rico, the Puerto Rico-based firm selected to develop this campaign, has nearly completed production of what we believe will be a very successful campaign.

The Census Bureau is strongly committed to excel in the conduct of Census 2000. Our plan effectively tackles the problems experienced in past censuses, especially concerns about improving the completeness of the count. The plan will allow the Census Bureau to meet the multiple, and sometimes competing, challenges that face the census in Puerto Rico. To ensure a census that will serve Puerto Rico, we will continue efforts to seek and implement suggestions from a wide variety of sources.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my testimony. I will be pleased to answer any questions.

SUMMARY TABLE FOR 1990 CENSUS

Summary Table P-a. AGE, SEX, AND GROUP QUARTERS: 1990
Geographic area: United States, regions, divisions, and states

(See text for definitions of terms and information on sampling variability)

Geographic area	Total population	Percent of population: Under 18 years	18 to 64 years	65 years and over	Median age	18 years and over: Males per 100 females	Percent of population in group quarters
United States	**248,709,873**	**25.6**	**61.8**	**12.6**	**32.9**	**91.9**	**2.7**
REGION AND DIVISION							
Northeast	**50,809,229**	**23.4**	**62.8**	**13.8**	**34.2**	**89.2**	**3.0**
New England	13,206,943	23.2	63.4	13.4	33.7	90.2	3.1
Middle Atlantic	37,602,286	23.5	62.6	13.9	34.3	88.8	2.8
Midwest	**59,668,632**	**26.2**	**60.8**	**13.0**	**32.9**	**90.8**	**2.7**
East North Central	42,008,942	26.1	61.3	12.6	32.9	90.6	2.5
West North Central	17,659,690	26.4	59.7	13.9	33.1	91.5	3.1
South	**85,445,930**	**25.8**	**61.6**	**12.6**	**32.7**	**91.0**	**2.7**
South Atlantic	43,566,853	24.1	62.5	13.4	33.6	91.0	2.9
East South Central	15,176,284	26.2	61.1	12.7	32.9	88.7	2.6
West South Central	26,702,793	28.2	60.7	11.1	31.2	92.4	2.5
West	**52,786,082**	**28.7**	**62.4**	**10.9**	**31.8**	**97.8**	**2.8**
Mountain	13,658,776	28.4	60.4	11.2	31.6	96.0	2.2
Pacific	39,127,306	26.0	63.1	10.9	31.8	98.1	2.5
STATE							
New England	**13,206,943**	**23.2**	**63.4**	**13.4**	**33.7**	**90.2**	**3.4**
Maine	1,227,928	25.2	61.5	13.3	33.9	91.6	3.0
New Hampshire	1,109,252	25.1	63.6	11.3	32.6	93.4	2.9
Vermont	562,758	25.4	62.8	11.8	33.0	92.6	3.8
Massachusetts	6,016,425	22.5	63.9	13.6	33.5	88.9	3.5
Rhode Island	1,003,464	22.5	62.5	15.0	33.9	88.7	3.8
Connecticut	3,287,116	22.8	63.6	13.6	34.4	91.0	3.1
Middle Atlantic	**37,602,286**	**23.5**	**62.6**	**13.9**	**34.3**	**88.8**	**2.8**
New York	17,990,455	23.7	63.2	13.1	33.6	88.5	3.0
New Jersey	7,730,188	23.3	63.3	13.4	34.4	90.3	2.2
Pennsylvania	11,881,643	23.5	61.1	15.4	35.0	88.3	2.9
East North Central	**42,008,942**	**26.1**	**61.3**	**12.6**	**32.9**	**90.6**	**2.5**
Ohio	10,847,115	25.8	61.2	13.0	33.3	89.1	2.4
Indiana	5,544,159	26.3	61.1	12.6	32.8	90.4	2.9
Illinois	11,430,602	25.8	61.6	12.6	32.8	91.0	2.5
Michigan	9,295,297	26.5	61.6	11.9	32.6	90.9	2.3
Wisconsin	4,891,769	26.4	60.3	13.3	32.9	92.5	2.7
West North Central	**17,659,690**	**26.4**	**59.7**	**13.9**	**33.1**	**91.5**	**3.1**
Minnesota	4,375,099	26.7	60.8	12.5	32.4	93.2	2.7
Iowa	2,776,755	25.9	58.8	15.3	34.0	90.3	3.6
Missouri	5,117,073	25.7	60.3	14.0	33.5	89.0	2.8
North Dakota	638,800	27.5	58.2	14.3	32.4	97.0	3.8
South Dakota	696,004	28.5	58.8	14.7	32.5	94.0	3.7
Nebraska	1,578,385	27.2	58.7	14.1	33.0	91.5	3.0
Kansas	2,477,574	26.7	59.5	13.8	32.9	92.9	3.3
South Atlantic	**43,566,853**	**24.1**	**62.5**	**13.4**	**33.6**	**91.0**	**2.9**
Delaware	666,168	24.5	63.4	12.1	32.8	90.9	3.0
Maryland	4,781,468	24.3	64.9	10.8	33.0	91.1	2.4
District of Columbia	606,900	19.3	67.9	12.8	33.4	84.0	6.9
Virginia	6,187,358	24.3	65.0	10.7	32.6	93.5	3.4
West Virginia	1,793,477	24.7	60.3	15.0	35.4	88.4	2.1
North Carolina	6,628,637	24.2	63.7	12.1	33.1	91.1	3.4
South Carolina	3,486,703	26.4	62.2	11.4	32.0	90.5	3.3
Georgia	6,478,216	26.7	63.2	10.1	31.5	90.8	2.7
Florida	12,937,926	22.2	59.5	18.3	36.3	90.8	2.4
East South Central	**15,176,284**	**26.2**	**61.1**	**12.7**	**32.9**	**88.7**	**2.6**
Kentucky	3,685,296	25.9	61.4	12.7	33.0	90.2	2.7
Tennessee	4,877,185	24.9	62.4	12.7	33.5	89.1	2.6
Alabama	4,040,587	26.2	60.9	12.9	33.0	87.8	2.3
Mississippi	2,573,216	29.0	58.5	12.5	31.1	86.9	2.7
West South Central	**26,702,793**	**28.2**	**60.7**	**11.1**	**31.2**	**92.4**	**2.5**
Arkansas	2,350,725	26.4	58.7	14.9	33.8	88.9	2.5
Louisiana	4,219,973	29.1	59.8	11.1	31.0	88.6	2.7
Oklahoma	3,145,585	26.6	59.9	13.5	33.1	91.2	3.0
Texas	16,986,510	28.5	61.4	10.1	30.7	94.1	2.3
Mountain	**13,658,776**	**28.4**	**60.4**	**11.2**	**31.6**	**96.0**	**2.2**
Montana	799,065	27.8	58.9	13.3	33.8	95.3	3.0
Idaho	1,006,749	30.6	57.4	12.0	31.5	96.3	2.1
Wyoming	453,588	29.9	59.7	10.4	32.1	98.0	2.3
Colorado	3,294,394	28.1	63.9	10.0	32.5	95.7	2.4
New Mexico	1,515,069	29.5	59.7	10.8	31.2	93.9	1.9
Arizona	3,665,228	28.8	60.1	13.1	32.2	95.1	2.2
Utah	1,722,850	36.4	54.9	8.7	26.3	95.0	1.7
Nevada	1,201,833	24.7	64.7	10.6	33.3	103.1	2.0
Pacific	**39,127,306**	**26.0**	**63.1**	**10.9**	**31.8**	**98.1**	**2.5**
Washington	4,866,692	25.9	62.3	11.8	33.1	96.1	2.5
Oregon	2,842,321	25.5	60.7	13.8	35.6	93.9	2.3
California	29,760,021	26.0	63.5	10.5	31.4	98.5	2.5
Alaska	550,043	31.3	64.6	4.1	29.4	113.6	3.8
Hawaii	1,108,229	25.3	63.4	11.3	32.6	102.7	3.4

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990 Census of Population.

ILLUSTRATIVE SUMMARY TABLE FOR CENSUS 2000 (with 1990 census data)

Summary Table P-a. AGE, SEX, AND GROUP QUARTERS: 1990
Geographic area: United States, regions, divisions, states, and Puerto Rico

(See text for definitions of terms and information on sampling variability)

Geographic area	Total population	Percent of population: Under 18 years	Percent of population: 18 to 54 years	Percent of population: 55 years and over	Median age	18 years and over: Males per 100 females	Percent of population in group quarters
United States	**248,709,873**	**25.5**	**61.8**	**12.6**	**32.9**	**91.9**	**2.7**
REGION AND DIVISION							
Northeast	**50,809,229**	**23.4**	**62.8**	**13.8**	**34.2**	**89.2**	**3.0**
New England	13,206,943	23.2	63.4	13.4	33.7	90.2	3.1
Middle Atlantic	37,602,286	23.5	62.6	13.9	34.3	88.8	2.8
Midwest	**59,668,632**	**26.2**	**60.8**	**13.0**	**32.9**	**90.8**	**2.7**
East North Central	42,008,942	26.1	61.3	12.6	32.9	90.6	2.5
West North Central	17,659,690	26.4	59.7	13.9	33.1	91.5	3.1
South	**85,445,930**	**25.8**	**61.6**	**12.6**	**32.7**	**91.0**	**2.7**
South Atlantic	43,566,853	24.1	62.5	13.4	33.6	91.0	2.9
East South Central	15,176,284	26.2	61.1	12.7	32.9	88.7	2.6
West South Central	26,702,793	28.2	60.7	11.1	31.2	92.4	2.5
West	**52,786,082**	**26.7**	**62.4**	**10.9**	**31.8**	**97.6**	**2.5**
Mountain	13,658,776	28.4	60.4	11.2	31.6	96.0	2.2
Pacific	39,127,306	26.0	63.1	10.9	31.8	98.1	2.5
STATE							
New England	**13,206,943**	**23.2**	**63.4**	**13.4**	**33.7**	**90.2**	**3.4**
Maine	1,227,928	25.2	61.5	13.3	33.9	91.6	3.0
New Hampshire	1,109,252	25.1	63.6	11.3	32.8	93.4	2.9
Vermont	562,758	25.4	62.8	11.8	33.0	92.8	3.8
Massachusetts	6,016,425	22.5	63.9	13.6	33.5	88.9	3.6
Rhode Island	1,003,464	22.5	62.5	15.0	33.9	88.7	3.8
Connecticut	3,287,116	22.8	63.6	13.6	34.4	91.0	3.1
Middle Atlantic	**37,602,286**	**23.5**	**62.6**	**13.9**	**34.3**	**88.8**	**2.8**
New York	17,990,455	23.7	63.2	13.1	33.8	88.5	3.0
New Jersey	7,730,188	23.3	63.3	13.4	34.4	90.3	2.2
Pennsylvania	11,881,643	23.5	61.1	15.4	35.0	88.3	2.9
East North Central	**42,008,942**	**26.1**	**61.3**	**12.6**	**32.9**	**90.6**	**2.5**
Ohio	10,847,115	25.8	61.2	13.0	33.3	89.1	2.4
Indiana	5,544,159	26.3	61.1	12.6	32.8	90.4	2.9
Illinois	11,430,602	25.8	61.6	12.6	32.9	91.0	2.5
Michigan	9,295,297	26.5	61.6	11.9	32.6	90.9	2.3
Wisconsin	4,891,769	26.4	60.3	13.3	32.9	92.5	2.7
West North Central	**17,659,690**	**26.4**	**59.7**	**13.9**	**33.1**	**91.5**	**3.1**
Minnesota	4,375,099	26.7	60.6	12.5	32.4	93.2	2.7
Iowa	2,776,755	25.9	58.8	15.3	34.0	90.3	3.6
Missouri	5,117,073	25.7	60.3	14.0	33.5	89.0	2.8
North Dakota	638,800	27.5	58.2	14.3	32.4	97.0	3.8
South Dakota	696,004	28.5	56.8	14.7	32.5	94.0	3.7
Nebraska	1,578,385	27.2	58.7	14.1	33.0	91.5	3.0
Kansas	2,477,574	26.7	59.5	13.8	32.9	92.9	3.3
South Atlantic	**43,566,853**	**24.1**	**62.5**	**13.4**	**33.6**	**91.0**	**2.9**
Delaware	666,168	24.5	63.4	12.1	32.8	90.9	3.0
Maryland	4,781,468	24.3	64.9	10.8	33.0	91.1	2.4
District of Columbia	606,900	19.3	67.9	12.8	33.4	84.0	5.9
Virginia	6,187,358	24.3	65.0	10.7	32.6	93.6	3.4
West Virginia	1,793,477	24.7	60.3	15.0	35.4	88.4	2.1
North Carolina	6,628,637	24.2	63.7	12.1	33.1	91.1	3.4
South Carolina	3,486,703	26.4	62.2	11.4	32.0	90.5	3.3
Georgia	6,478,216	26.7	63.2	10.1	31.5	90.8	2.7
Florida	12,937,926	22.2	59.5	18.3	36.3	90.8	2.4
East South Central	**15,176,284**	**26.2**	**61.1**	**12.7**	**32.9**	**88.7**	**2.6**
Kentucky	3,685,296	25.9	61.4	12.7	33.0	90.2	2.7
Tennessee	4,877,185	24.9	62.4	12.7	33.5	89.1	2.6
Alabama	4,040,587	26.2	60.9	12.9	33.0	87.8	2.3
Mississippi	2,573,216	29.0	58.5	12.5	31.1	86.9	2.7
West South Central	**26,702,793**	**28.2**	**60.7**	**11.1**	**31.2**	**92.4**	**2.5**
Arkansas	2,350,725	26.4	58.7	14.9	33.8	86.9	2.5
Louisiana	4,219,973	29.1	59.8	11.1	31.0	88.6	2.7
Oklahoma	3,145,585	26.6	59.9	13.5	33.1	91.2	3.0
Texas	16,986,510	28.5	61.4	10.1	30.7	94.1	2.3
Mountain	**13,658,776**	**28.4**	**60.4**	**11.2**	**31.6**	**96.0**	**2.2**
Montana	799,065	27.8	58.9	13.3	33.8	95.3	3.0
Idaho	1,006,749	30.6	57.4	12.0	31.5	96.3	2.1
Wyoming	453,588	29.9	59.7	10.4	32.1	98.0	2.5
Colorado	3,294,394	26.1	63.9	10.0	32.5	95.7	2.4
New Mexico	1,515,069	29.5	59.7	10.8	31.2	93.9	1.9
Arizona	3,665,228	26.8	60.1	13.1	32.2	95.1	2.2
Utah	1,722,850	36.4	54.9	8.7	26.3	95.0	1.7
Nevada	1,201,833	24.7	64.7	10.6	33.3	103.1	2.0
Pacific	**39,127,306**	**26.0**	**63.1**	**10.9**	**31.8**	**98.1**	**2.5**
Washington	4,866,692	25.9	62.3	11.8	33.1	96.1	2.5
Oregon	2,842,321	25.5	60.7	13.8	35.6	93.9	2.3
California	29,760,021	26.0	63.5	10.5	31.4	98.5	2.5
Alaska	550,043	31.3	64.6	4.1	29.4	113.6	3.8
Hawaii	1,108,229	25.3	63.4	11.3	32.6	102.7	3.4
Puerto Rico	**3,522,037**	**32.8**	**57.6**	**9.7**	**28.4**	**89.5**	**1.0**

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990 Census of Population

TABLE SHOWING AREA AND POPULATION COVERED BY THE 1990 CENSUS

Attachment 2, p. 1

Table 1. Population and Housing Units, 1970 to 1990; Area Measurements: 1990

(For information concerning historical counts, see "User Notes." For definitions of terms and meanings of symbols, see text)

Area	Population			Housing units			1990 area measurements					
							Total area		Land area		Water area	
	1990	1980	1970	1990	1980	1970	Square kilometers	Square miles	Square kilometers	Square miles	Square kilometers	Square miles
Total	**253,498,149**	**231,103,121**	**208,066,557**	**(NA)**	**(NA)**	**(NA)**	**(NA)**	**(NA)**	**9,170,045.0**	**3,540,557.9**	**(NA)**	**(NA)**
United States	248,709,873	226,542,199	203,302,031	102,263,678	88,410,827	68,704,315	9,809,155.3	3,787,318.7	9,159,116.0	3,536,338.2	650,039.3	250,980.4
Outlying areas under United States jurisdiction	3,862,431	3,565,376	3,026,690	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	10,929.0	4,219.7	(NA)	(NA)
Territories	3,862,238	3,564,294	2,977,618	1,281,979	1,082,223	771,699	25,371.4	9,795.8	10,887.7	4,203.7	14,483.7	5,592.1
American Samoa	46,773	32,297	27,159	6,959	4,722	4,492	1,510.7	583.2	200.3	77.3	1,310.4	505.9
Guam	133,152	105,979	84,996	35,223	28,249	16,680	1,477.9	570.6	543.5	209.8	934.4	360.8
Northern Mariana Islands	43,345	16,780	9,640	8,210	3,373	1,598	5,050.2	1,949.9	463.7	179.0	4,586.5	1,770.9
Palau	15,122	12,116	11,210	3,312	2,294	1,787	1,631.6	629.9	459.2	177.3	1,172.4	452.6
Puerto Rico	3,522,037	3,196,520	2,712,033	1,188,985	993,678	713,713	13,791.0	5,324.7	8,874.6	3,426.5	4,916.4	1,898.2
Virgin Islands of the United States	101,809	96,569	62,468	39,290	33,548	20,814	1,910.0	737.5	346.4	133.8	1,563.6	603.7
Other U.S. possessions	193	1,082	4,874	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	41.3	16.0	(NA)	(NA)
Baker, Howland, and Jarvis Islands	-	-	-	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	7.5	2.9	(NA)	(NA)
Johnston Atoll	173	327	1,007	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	2.8	1.1	(NA)	(NA)
Kingman Reef	-	-	-	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	1.0	0.4	(NA)	(NA)
Midway Islands	13	453	2,220	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	6.4	2.5	(NA)	(NA)
Navassa Island	-	-	-	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	5.2	2.0	(NA)	(NA)
Palmyra Atoll	-	-	-	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	11.9	4.6	(NA)	(NA)
Wake Island	7	302	1,647	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	6.5	2.5	(NA)	(NA)
U.S. population abroad	925,845	995,546	1,737,836	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Federal employees	(NA)	562,962	1,114,224	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Armed Forces	529,269	515,408	1,057,776	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Civilians	(NA)	47,554	56,448	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Dependents of Federal employees	(NA)	432,584	371,366	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Crews of U.S. merchant vessels	3,026	(NA)	15,910	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...

Note: Data for 1970 and 1980 for outlying areas under the United States jurisdiction and for territories include territory not enumerated in 1990.

ILLUSTRATIVE TABLE SHOWING AREA AND POPULATION WITH PUERTO RICO MOVED FROM OUTLYING AREAS TO THE UNITED STATES, USING 1990 CENSUS FORMAT

Table 1. Population and Housing Units, 1970 to 1990; Area Measurements: 1990

(For information concerning historical counts, see "User Notes." For definitions of terms and meanings of symbols, see text)

Area	Population			Housing units			1990 area measurements					
							Total area		Land area		Water area	
	1990	1980	1970	1990	1980	1970	Square kilometers	Square miles	Square kilometers	Square miles	Square kilometers	Square miles
Total	**253,498,149**	**231,103,121**	**208,066,557**	**(NA)**	**(NA)**	**(NA)**	**(NA)**	**(NA)**	**9,170,045.0**	**3,540,557.9**	**(NA)**	**(NA)**
United States	252,231,910	229,738,719	206,014,064	103,452,663	89,404,305	69,418,028	9,822,946.3	3,792,643.4	9,167,990.6	3,539,764.7	654,955.7	252,878.6
Outlying areas under United States jurisdiction	340,394	368,856	314,657	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	2,054.4	793.2	(NA)	(NA)
Territories	340,201	367,774	265,585	92,994	88,545	57,986	11,580.4	4,471.1	2,013.1	777.2	9,567.3	3,693.9
American Samoa	46,773	32,297	27,159	6,959	4,722	4,492	1,510.7	583.2	200.3	77.3	1,310.4	505.9
Guam	133,152	105,979	84,996	35,223	28,249	16,680	1,477.9	570.6	543.5	209.8	934.4	360.8
Northern Mariana Islands	43,345	16,780	9,640	8,210	3,373	1,598	5,050.2	1,949.9	463.7	179.0	4,586.5	1,770.9
Palau	15,122	12,116	11,210	3,312	2,294	1,767	1,631.6	629.9	459.2	177.3	1,172.4	452.6
Virgin Islands of the United States	101,809	96,569	62,468	39,290	33,548	20,814	1,910.0	737.5	346.4	133.8	1,563.6	603.7
Other U.S. possessions	193	1,082	4,874	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	41.3	16.0	(NA)	(NA)
Baker, Howland, and Jarvis Islands	-	-	-	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	7.5	2.9	(NA)	(NA)
Johnston Atoll	173	327	1,007	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	2.8	1.1	(NA)	(NA)
Kingman Reef	-	-	-	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	1.0	0.4	(NA)	(NA)
Midway Islands	13	453	2,220	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	6.4	2.5	(NA)	(NA)
Navassa Island	-	-	-	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	5.2	2.0	(NA)	(NA)
Palmyra Atoll	-	-	-	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	11.9	4.6	(NA)	(NA)
Wake Island	7	302	1,647	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	6.5	2.5	(NA)	(NA)
U.S. population abroad	925,845	995,546	1,737,836	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Federal employees	(NA)	562,962	1,114,224	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Armed Forces	529,269	515,408	1,057,776	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Civilians	(NA)	47,554	56,448	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Dependents of Federal employees	(NA)	432,584	371,368	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Crews of U.S. merchant vessels	3,026	(NA)	15,910	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...

Note: Data for 1970 and 1980 for outlying areas under the United States jurisdiction and for territories include territory not enumerated in 1990.

Mr. MILLER. We all know this is a complicated issue, and you used the words historic change and issue of statistical redefinition. And so, let's start off with the question of statistical redefinition. Would you explain that a little bit more? The question that Mr. Serrano used is the national summary data products. If we included a redefinition, what does that mean and what are the implications of that?

Dr. PREWITT. It is unfortunate we don't have precise language for this information. National summary data products, an example of which is in appendix 1 or attachment 1, in national summary data products, Puerto Rico will be included and all of those that the Census Bureau produces after 2000. That has been made possible because we now have a questionnaire strategy and a methodology in Puerto Rico that is practically completely comparable, which means every table where any data are presented by region or State, Puerto Rico will be identified. That means anyone who wants to compare Puerto Rico with Maine or with California can do it just like they can compare California and Maine or any other kind of procedure.

That's our national summary tables. Then there's something in the report language called the Nation's total or the national total and, as I said, we have interpreted that to mean the United States for our purposes. In our tabular presentation, we have a line called "the United States." That's where we would not be putting the Puerto Rico total. So, the statistical inconsistency would be that, if we follow the report language. We would now be redefining that line called the United States, as Congressman Serrano correctly pointed out, approximately 3.8 million people.

We would not, under the report language, be including the overseas population, which we do count, the diplomatic and military population, for example. We would still have two different counts. We would have a total that had everything in it, including the overseas population and the other insular areas but not Puerto Rico. Well, everything because it includes Puerto Rico but then a U.S. line that excluded the overseas population, the other insular areas but not Puerto Rico. So that would be redefining the key line that says the United States. And my simple point is we have not had extensive conversations with other members of the Federal statistical agency, and my one example from Bureau of Labor Statistics suggests that we would then have a different definition of the United States than would the BLS, unless we could somehow coordinate with them.

And we don't know—I just haven't had the time yet, Mr. Congressman, to explore exactly—I know this would be different from how the Department of Education collects statistics, how the Department of Transportation collects and so forth. It's not that it can't be done. It's that it ought to be done in consultation with the other agencies that will be affected by the decision we would be making.

Mr. MILLER. When I raised the question with the previous panel, they used the analogy that when we added States to the Union back in the late 1950's, the last time that happened, the numbers were incorporated because they were much smaller population

States at that time than Puerto Rico. Because one of the problems is the apples and oranges problem.

Dr. PREWITT. Let me refer back to 1950. Prior to 1950, we treated Alaska and Hawaii exactly as we're treating Puerto Rico now. Indeed, we treated Puerto Rico, Alaska, and Hawaii roughly in the same way. After Statehood for Alaska and Hawaii in 1950, in the 1960 census, we obviously included Alaska and Hawaii as States. However, we also presented tables that helped the user understand what had happened so that we tried to help the user make comparisons back to 1950. So, we really ran a dual set of tables for some of the key tables so people could understand what is happening because you do get a funny blip.

There's no doubt we could do this with Puerto Rico. That is, we could create after 2000, if we put Puerto Rico into the national total, we would try to create a number of duplicate tables so that the data users could try to see what had happened. It's a bit different because we included Alaska and Hawaii in our definition of the United States because they had become States. This would be the first time in which we included an entity that was not a State in the U.S. total. So, it would be a change from what we did in 1960. It's feasible. It can be done. But it does have consequences.

Mr. MILLER. The proposal that you're planning on using right now basically allows anyone—because it's readily available on the computer—to do any calculation they want with or without Puerto Rico. It's just that the published numbers, especially when you get to the definition of the United States, will not be. Mr. Romero-Barceló was saying we don't have the data, but they will have the data this time around. It's not a question of not having the data. It's what's going to be presented.

Dr. PREWITT. That's right. Congressman Romero-Barceló basically in his commentary was referring to conditions prior to 2000 when the data were not available and created the obstacles and so forth. The kinds of arguments he was making—and he, of course, said this in his commentary, will not hold after 2000, because all the data will be available, as attachment 1 indicates.

Mr. MILLER. Let me ask one more quick question. How are we going to treat the territories, American Samoa and the Virgin Islands and such? Are we going to be doing the same census with those areas? And why aren't we treating them the same way we're treating Puerto Rico?

Dr. PREWITT. As Congressman Faleomavaega referenced, we do the census completely differently. We contract it. It is done by the local governments and their own statistical offices under technical guidance from us. That is, we provide the guidelines, and the actual census is conducted there according to their own local needs as he so eloquently pointed out. They are saying "We don't want a census imposed upon us because we have very different, different kinds, in this case, land tenure patterns, different kinds of patterns."

We simply go to them and say, what makes the most sense for you? And they say, this is the kind of data we need for our internal planning purposes and government purposes. We say, good, we'll help you design that census.

We then actually pay them. That is part of the appropriation bill. There is a sum of money for each of the insular areas where we actually contract to them to do the work under our technical guidance.

We then process the data and tabulate it, but because it's not consistent at all, we have to have separate data products that describe the insular territories, and they're different from one another because they have different properties and different needs.

As he said, this is a perfectly comfortable relationship. There would be nothing to prevent us because we do a total count—there would be nothing to prevent us from putting the count of Samoa or the Virgin Islands or Guam into the definition of United States. It would again even make more complicated the denominator because, whereas some of the other statistical agencies do work in Puerto Rico, they do not do much work at all in the insular territories. So we would have a denominator again in the official U.S. total produced by the Census Bureau that would not be consistent with the denominator of the United States being used by other statistical agencies.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you.

Mrs. Maloney.

Mrs. MALONEY. Thank you, Dr. Prewitt, for your testimony.

Looking earlier at the statistical abstract, there seems to be different total populations of the United States for 1990, and each one had a different total. Two are labeled total resident population, but the 1990 population is different. There is one labeled total civilian population. Then there is the total civilian noninstitutional population used by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. These all differ from the total U.S. population for apportionment. On the other hand, your testimony seems to indicate that there is really only one total U.S. population, and can you explain to me why we have all these different total populations?

Dr. PREWITT. You're quite right, Mrs. Maloney. There are different totals produced because they have different functions, and the total that would be used by the BLS is the noninstitutional labor force. The total we obviously use for apportionment counts does exclude the District of Columbia because it cannot be in the apportionment counts, so you simply do produce different totals for different purposes. And, as I've said, it's feasible if we want to redefine something——

There is a key U.S. total—and I take you back to attachment 2. That line that says the United States is our basic U.S. total minus all of the other categories that are listed on that page which are the population abroad, the other possessions outlined, jurisdictions and so forth. So, that is the total for apportionment purposes.

Mrs. MALONEY. Given that we already have all these different definitions, why can't the problems you raise be dealt with simply by the addition of another definition and allowing agencies to choose the denominator that is best suited for its purposes? That is, the BLS uses the population number that's best suited for it. Could we not just add another definition that included——

Dr. PREWITT. Certainly. Indeed, you can take this table and you can run as many different totals as you want to. We have a total count. We have a U.S. residency total. We could then have a list

including/not including Puerto Rico, including/not including insular areas, so on and so forth. We can run as many different presentations as you want.

These data are all electronic. Anyone can do that.

I haven't talked to all of my colleagues in the other statistical agencies. I have talked to BLS, which is the major other statistical agency which has to worry about this question. But my guess is that primarily, they would use as the U.S. total the 248,709,873 as adjusted throughout the decade. And all I'm recommending is that before we redefine something called the United States, that we should do it with some sort of consultation, a thorough review as to its implications. I don't think they've all—I'll give you one other example. I'm sorry that Mr. Serrano is not here. The United Nations has a special entry for Puerto Rico, for example. It lists the population of Puerto Rico independently of the United States. Now, why the United Nations does that, I don't know, but it does. I presume if we put Puerto Rico in—and they then list something called the U.S. total.

If we put Puerto Rico into our U.S. total, I think the United Nations would have to drop Puerto Rico as one of its entries because they would otherwise be double counting. So those kinds of implications, I don't think somebody sat down and worked out the whole array of them, and something of this magnitude has unintended consequences. All I'm recommending to you today is that that work be done before we move to a new statistical definition of the United States.

Mrs. MALONEY. But both President Carter and President Bush, in transmitting the apportionment data to Congress, presented a total U.S. population that included the District of Columbia but not Puerto Rico and the other territories. What will you recommend be included in President Clinton's submission? Will the total population include Puerto Rico and the outlying areas?

Dr. PREWITT. I'm surprised at what you just said. I thought the apportionment numbers always exclude the District of Columbia and only included the 50 States, including, I should say, the 50 States and the overseas population which is assigned to a particular State. Then, as you know, when we reproduce the redistricting data, we take out the overseas population because we can't put them down to the block level. Therefore, I'm sorry, I'm just ill-equipped to answer this question because it's inconsistent with what I thought we did.

Mrs. MALONEY. We have a document that says that's what they did.

Dr. PREWITT. I can't imagine what then happened with the apportionment process if the District of Columbia count was in it.

Mrs. MALONEY. We'll get it to you.

Is there any technical difficulty in presenting the census data as requested by Representative Serrano? Is there any technical difficulty in doing it? Is there any scientific difficulty in presenting the data as requested by Representative Serrano?

Dr. PREWITT. No, as I suggested, at a certain point we do write the software that drives all the tabular displays and, as I've suggested, much later than April 30, 2000. By then, we're trying to

close down all of our software preparation for tabular presentation. So, up until then, there really is no technical impediment.

Mrs. MALONEY. Here is the data.

Dr. PREWITT. I'm interested.

Mrs. MALONEY. Thank you again for your diligent testimony and your commitment and hard work. Delegates Romero-Barceló and Faleomavaega mentioned how helpful the Census Bureau has been in working with their two territories and getting an accurate count, so I join my voice in thanking you. I have no further questions.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Davis.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Prewitt, let me just reiterate the question that I asked the Members relative to the distribution of resources. Would you see any shift in resource allocation and distribution should we use the Serrano language?

Dr. PREWITT. Mr. Davis, that's a very complicated question in which I can't give you much intelligence. We tried to do a bit of work on that this week and simply could not complete the work. As Mr. Serrano said, it's an issue of how Federal agencies and the relevant congressional committees would write their formulas; and I think it would create some uncertainties as to how those formulas would be produced. They're not unsolvable, but I don't think you can automatically presume there would be a redistribution of resources. But certainly every formula would have to take into account that they're now working with a somewhat different denominator. Maybe in every formula they either back it out or put it in depending.

Could I, while I have the floor, and something else because I have the piece of paper Mrs. Maloney handed me. As I read it, it says that the District of Columbia is excluded in determination of apportionment, which is exactly what I thought I testified to.

Mrs. MALONEY. Is it included in the total?

Dr. PREWITT. This is included in the total, but that's consistent with what I just said about this attachment, which is we include the District of Columbia in the total, statistical definition of the United States, but, obviously, for apportionment purposes, we would exclude it in terms of delivering the apportionment numbers because we don't apportion including the District of Columbia.

Sorry, Mr. Davis.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. That's quite all right.

Let me just appreciate your answer in terms of the complexity of the question, and also I probably need to just make it clear that, should it result in some shift in changes based upon the realities of the population, I certainly wouldn't have a problem with it. So, it's not suggested that I personally would have any problem with it. I'm just trying to understand as best that I can the issue.

The final question that I have is, am I to now really understand that the primary reason one would not necessarily want to use the language that is proposed by Mr. Serrano is because there has not been the time to work in comparability with other users, other stakeholders, in that the Census Bureau would then perhaps have data reported in a different manner than some other entities that we coordinate data with?

Dr. PREWITT. Yes, sir. That is the Census Bureau's hesitancy. I come before you as a head of a statistical agency, not as a constitutional lawyer or as a policy advisor. There could be other kinds of issues implicit in this that would not be ours, but from the point of view of the Census Bureau, our hesitancy has to do with complications, difficulties, confusions, inconsistencies in the statistical system it may create that we believe should be examined and make sure we're not doing some sort of harm.

We may, after examination, come back and say, look, we can fix all of this. We've now had the kinds of conversations and so forth and so on. But I can just say we've not yet had that opportunity. We would see this, of course, because it would be interagency, as the responsibility of the Office of Statistical Policy, not just the Census Bureau's responsibility.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. I thank you very much, and I have no further questions.

I'd also like to indicate my appreciation for the work that you did and also the consistency relative to the way that you have looked at technical issues and technical problems throughout the process, and so I don't see any deviation from that relative to the response that you've given today. Thank you very much.

Mr. MILLER. I just have one clarification question.

This is a little description of the methodology you used for Puerto Rico. This is the first time we're doing the full-fledged census. Is there any unique challenges, unique cost because of it that you're experiencing down there? Just describe it, very briefly, the process that's being used.

Dr. PREWITT. I think the biggest difference in Puerto Rico is that we can't really use just a mailout-mailback system. We've got to use all update leave.

It was quite difficult. We've done it, but it was quite difficult to assemble an address file. But the postal system in Puerto Rico is not such that we can simply mail a questionnaire out. So we've got to do a full update leave. And we have no idea because we haven't had this experience—see, all previous censuses in Puerto Rico, we went out and did the enumeration ourselves. This time, we'll be delivering the form and hoping they'll mail it back. We don't know what to expect in the mail response rate, for example. We think it creates all other kinds of implications. What size labor pool are we going to need for a nonresponse followup? If we had a high response rate, we would need a much smaller pool, of course, but we have no historical experience to make a guess as to what the response rate is likely to be in Puerto Rico. So that's a technical issue.

There are some very complicated questionnaire issues which we have worked out with the Puerto Rico authorities. When they actually unfold, they're going to say, "Oh, I didn't know that's what the implication of that would be." But we'll work with those as we go. But I think, operationally, by far the most complicated thing is it is a very highly scattered population, but we're optimistic that our address file work gives us the basis and that our update leave will work, but until we're actually out in the field—Terry, you want to add anything?

Does she need to be sworn?

Mr. MILLER. It's policy that we do it. If you would just stand and raise your right hand.

[Witness sworn.]

STATEMENT OF TERESA ANGUEIRA, ASSISTANT DIVISION CHIEF, DECENNIAL MANAGEMENT DIVISION

Ms. ANGUEIRA. I just wanted to add that it's the first time we're using the update leave methodology. We will have to cover the ground twice in Puerto Rico, once to create the address list, which we have already done, and once to deliver the questionnaires.

As far as cost, the cost comparison, Dr. Prewitt was talking about nonresponse followup. What we did in 1990 was conduct the census with a list enumerating methodology, which is basically 100 percent nonresponse followup, if I can use that term freely. In other words, we were using the nonresponse followup methodology at every household, delivering the questionnaire for the first time at that moment and collecting the interview at that moment. We hope to reduce that cost by using the update leave methodology and hope to receive a substantial proportion, which is hard to predict, of the questionnaires in the mail and reduce our nonresponse followup workload.

Mr. MILLER. Let me thank you.

I think we should all be pleased. As I think Mr. Serrano also acknowledged, we're making a giant stride in the right direction to get comparable data, so we'll have that, but it does raise, as you say, historic redefinition problems in the statistical community that we need to address and think through thoroughly before you jump.

So, with that, the hearing is now concluded. Thank you.

Excuse me. I withdraw that. I need to ask unanimous consent.

I ask unanimous consent that all Members' and witnesses' written opening statements be included in the record. Without objection, so ordered. And if the Delegate, Donna Christensen of the U.S. Virgin Islands, who was not able to be with us today, wishes to have something submitted for the record, I ask unanimous consent that that be included in the record.

With that, the meeting is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:55 a.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

○