Bullseye!

Census 2000 Dress Rehearsal on Target So Far

“Ahead of schedule and within budget” – that’s how Commerce Secretary William Daley characterized the Census 2000 Dress Rehearsal currently going on in three sites around the country.

Daley and acting Census Bureau Director James Holmes gave an update at a press conference in early July. Daley said the Census Bureau’s plan for Census 2000 “is solid and strong.”

Acting Director Holmes told reporters that so far “in all three locations we pretty much hit our targets.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Mail response rate EXPECTED</th>
<th>Mail response rate ACTUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menominee</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Holmes said Census Bureau telephone assistance personnel had received about 23,000 calls, of which 95 percent were in English, 4 percent in Spanish and the rest in other languages. Fewer than 5 percent of the callers wanted to have their questionnaires completed over the telephone. Fifty-six percent of the calls were handled by an automated system; the rest by operators.

Noting that the Census Bureau had planned that for every two job offers, one would be turned down, Holmes

Continued on page 3

Federal Court Hears Arguments in Lawsuit Against Census Sampling

In June, a three-judge U.S. District Court panel began hearing oral arguments in a lawsuit aimed at halting sampling for nonresponse in Census 2000.

District of Columbia Circuit Court Judge Douglas Ginsburg was joined by District Judges Royce C. Lamberth and Ricardo Urbina in presiding over U.S. House of Representatives v. U.S. Department of Commerce, the first of two lawsuits asserting that the Constitution and the Census Act (Title 13, United States Code) prohibit sampling in the census.

The Census Bureau has proposed to sample nonrespondents once 90 percent of the population in a given census tract is counted. We also propose to use an independent quality check, the Integrated Coverage Measurement

Continued on page 8
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Dr. Kenneth Prewitt Nominated as Next Census Bureau Director

In June, President Clinton announced his intent to nominate Kenneth Prewitt, currently president of the Social Science Research Council of New York, as the next director of the U.S. Census Bureau.

Prewitt would replace acting Census Bureau Director James F. Holmes, who has served in the post since the resignation last January of Martha Farnsworth Riche.

Commenting on the proposed nomination, Commerce Secretary William Daley said, “Ken Prewitt will be a worthy successor to Jim Holmes. He is one of this nation’s most distinguished social scientists and experienced executives. He is a proven manager of complex nonprofit and statistical organizations.”

During his career, Prewitt has been a senior vice president of the Rockefeller Foundation, and director of the University of Chicago’s National Opinion Research Corporation, one of the nation’s largest private sector statistical organizations.

If confirmed as Census Bureau director, Prewitt stated that his priorities would include –

• Working closely with the Congress and the Administration to establish in principle and in fact that the Census Bureau is a nonpartisan agency obligated by law and guided by professional traditions to present the most accurate statistics technically possible, at a reasonable cost.

• Asserting the integrity of the statistical system and ensure the public confidence in official statistics.

• Conducting the most accurate and cost-effective census possible.

Questions?

• Press inquiries
  Public Information Office
  U.S. Census Bureau
  Washington, DC 20233-0900
  Phone: 301-457-3030
  Fax: 301-457-3670
  E-mail: pio@census.gov

• Product Information
  Customer Services
  U.S. Census Bureau
  Phone and fax orders:
  Phone: 301-457-4100
  Fax: 888-249-7295
  TDD: 301-457-4611

Census Regional Offices

Atlanta 404-730-3833
TDD 404-730-3964

Boston 617-424-0510
TDD 617-424-0565

Charlotte 704-344-6144
TDD 704-344-6548

Chicago 708-562-1740
TDD 708-562-1791

Dallas 214-640-4470
TDD 214-640-4434

Denver 303-969-7750
TDD 303-969-6769

Detroit 313-259-1875
TDD 313-259-5169

Kansas City 913-551-6711
TDD 913-551-5839

Los Angeles 818-904-6339
TDD 818-904-6249

New York 212-264-4730
TDD 212-264-3863

Philadelphia 215-656-7578
TDD 215-656-7550

Seattle 206-553-5835
TDD 206-553-5859
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The Census Monitoring Board, established in a funding bill last fall as part of the compromise agreement over the use of sampling in the census, has held two meetings so far and has another scheduled in early August.

At the first meeting, held in a House of Representatives meeting room, all eight board members gave brief remarks. Some suggested that they were skeptical of the Census Bureau’s plan to supplement traditional counting methods with statistical sampling and others stated that the census could not be improved without adding new methods.

The board discussed administrative matters for most of the session, deciding how to allocate its annual $4 million budget, hire staff and keep track of spending.

The second meeting took place at Census Bureau headquarters. Acting Census Bureau Director James Holmes reported that the dress rehearsal had met or exceeded expectations so far and fielded questions from the board on progress to date.

President Clinton made his first extended public comments about Census 2000 on June 2, in a visit to the Magnolia Multi-Service Center WIC facility in Houston, Texas. He was participating in a roundtable discussion with community leaders.

Roundtable participants discussed the importance of an accurate census to transportation, housing, health and child care, rural development, education and other policies and programs.

The President said he wanted to “put a human face on the census and its consequences” and that “an inaccurate census distorts our understanding of the needs of our people and diminishes the quality of life not only for them, but for all the rest of us as well.” He said the Census Bureau must use “the most up-to-date, scientific, cost-effective methods” to take an accurate census.

President Clinton calls for a more accurate count.

“This is not a political issue, this is an American issue,” Clinton said, noting that it was “unfortunate” that some in Congress oppose the use of sampling to count the population.

The President acknowledged the difficulty in explaining to the general public why sampling can help produce a more accurate count.

The clock is ticking. As of the first of August, there were only 517 days to the Year 2000. The Census Bureau has already taken steps to address our other Year 2000 deadline.

“All Census Bureau automation will be Year 2000 compliant by the end of this year,” observes Y2K project director Debra Williams.

said actual acceptance rates were much higher than expected – 90 percent in South Carolina, 78 percent in Sacramento and 71 percent in Menominee.

“We planned for a 100 percent turnover in all three sites,” he said, but actual turnover rates were much lower – 38 percent in Menominee and less than 25 percent in Sacramento and South Carolina.

“Nonresponse follow-up, our largest dress rehearsal operation, is finished in all three sites.... We finished on time and within budget,” Holmes said. The operation took six weeks in Sacramento and Menominee and eight weeks in South Carolina.

He said the Integrated Coverage Measurement (ICM) sample survey and quality check was now under way in Sacramento and Menominee and the Post-Enumeration Survey had begun in South Carolina.

Results of the ICM, under the Census Bureau plan, will be factored into the final “one-number” total for the two sites where it is being used. He said it was too early to comment on how that operation was going.

Commerce Secretary Daley warned that if full funding for Census 2000 is delayed “even one week” this fall it could force the layoff of thousands of temporary census workers and “put the entire census at risk.”
Community Profiles on New CD-ROM Show Shape of Things to Come

A new CD-ROM with community-profile data gives users their first look at the Census Bureau’s innovative American Community Survey.

The disc shows data for four test locations: Portland/Multnomah County, Oregon; Rockland County, New York; Fulton County, Pennsylvania; and Brevard County, Florida.

“The American Community Survey will give local residents more current and accurate economic, demographic and housing information every year,” said James Holmes, acting Census Bureau director. “Right now this kind of detailed information is only collected once every 10 years on the long form of the decennial census.

“In 2010, we expect the American Community Survey to replace the long form. But, long before then, community leaders will be able to use data from the American Community Survey to make decisions about planning and economic development.”

To make the data on the CD-ROM accessible to a diverse range of users, the Census Bureau chose Beyond 20/20™, an off-the-shelf software program developed by Ivation Datasystems, Inc.

Census Bureau, GeoResearch Announce Partnership to Improve Tiger Information

The Census Bureau has entered into a partnership with GeoResearch Inc. of Bethesda, Maryland, to improve the Census Bureau’s geographic database so the Bureau can more efficiently conduct censuses and surveys in the next century.

The agreement, signed in March, provides for the use of GeoResearch’s GeoLink® software to verify and update information in the Census Bureau’s Topologically Integrated Geographic Encoding and Referencing (TIGER) system.

GeoLink uses Global Positioning System satellite technology to obtain the geographic coordinates of residential addresses and other map features.

“GeoLink also should reduce the need for Census Bureau staff to have to go into the field before each census to verify the locations of residential addresses.”

This agreement continues a new era of collaboration between the Census Bureau and the private sector.

For GeoResearch, the agreement provides a practical test of GeoLink’s geographic data-collection capabilities, giving the company insights into ways the software can be used interactively with TIGER data for other clients.

Data are on the CD-ROM in three formats:

- Profiles – a summary table for each county (for example, total population and median income).
- Summary tabulations similar to census sample data, for areas as small as census tracts (for example, commuting patterns, income and poverty status and educational attainment).
- Public-use microdata files (except for Fulton County) so users can construct their own tabulations.

The software lets users browse or search tables; generate customized tables and charts; or display tables, charts and maps side by side.

If Congress continues to authorize the funds, starting in 2003 every county in the country will be participating in the ACS. The national sample will be 3 million housing units a year.


Young Women Have Edge in Education

Percent of men and women age 25 to 29 years old: 1997

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High school degree or more</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college or more</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s or more</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Foreign-Born Population Reaches 25.8 Million

In 1997, nearly 1 in 10 residents of the United States (25.8 million) was foreign born and about 1 in 3 of these foreign-born residents was a naturalized citizen.

“The biggest influx of foreign born was from the Americas – Central and South America and the Caribbean,” said Dianne Schmidley, author of the report, *The Foreign Born Population in the United States: March 1997 (Update)*.

“About 7 million people, or 1 in 4 of the total foreign born population in the United States in 1997, were born in Mexico.”

One out of every 2 foreign-born residents was a native of Central America, South America or the Caribbean (13.1 million). One in 4 was born in Asia, and about 1 in 5 originated in Europe.


Contact:  
Dianne Schmidley  
301-457-2403  
<audrey.d.schmidley@ccmail.census.gov>

Fewest Foreign Born in Midwest, Most in West

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Newer Immigrants Less Likely to Be Naturalized Citizens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of arrival</th>
<th>Naturalized</th>
<th>Not a citizen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990-1997</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-1989</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-1979</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 1970</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Traditional Family Nowhere Near Extinct

Traditional families – married couples with children – have begun to stabilize as a percentage of all families in the 1990s. On the other hand, the growth of single-parent families – those maintained by a mother or father with no spouse present – has slowed.

“The perceived decline of the American family is vanishing and the ’90s represents a stabilization period,” notes Ken Bryson, co-author of the source report.

“For example, the percentage of married couples with children fell from 50 percent to 37 percent of all families between 1970 and 1990. Since then it has only dropped 1 percentage point.”

Lynne Casper, the report’s other author, adds, “Growth in the proportion of single-parent families had slowed in the meantime.”


Contacts:  
Ken Bryson  
301-457-2465  
<kbryon@census.gov>  
Lynne Casper  
301-457-2416  
<lcasper@census.gov>
Cellular Still Strong

The cellular telephone industry continues to surge as it has throughout this decade.

Between 1995 and 1996, cellular phones and other radiotelephones showed an increase of 25 percent in operating revenues, again the biggest increase among telephone communication industries.

The Census Bureau gathers this information in the Annual Survey of Communication Services, along with data on broadcast and cable TV and radio.


Contact:
Jeff Barnett
301-457-2823
<jefrey.l.barnett@ccmail.census.gov>

Ohio Tops in the Rubber and Plastics Business

Ohio is still our leading rubber- and plastics-producing state. In 1996, as measured by the Annual Survey of Manufactures, Ohio had $13.7 billion in shipments, about 9 percent of the U.S. total. California ranked second with $11.4 billion in shipments.

Other leading rubber- and plastics-producing states include Illinois ($10.6 billion), Michigan ($9.0 billion), Texas (8.2 billion), Indiana ($7.7 billion), North Carolina ($7.3 billion), Pennsylvania ($7.0 billion), Tennessee ($5.5 billion) and New York ($4.8 billion).

Overall rubber and plastics industries showed no change in the number of workers between 1995 and 1996; value of shipments rose from $145.7 billion to $150.5 billion.


Contact:
Julius Smith
301-457-4741
<julius.smith.jr@ccmail.census.gov>

Telephone Industry in Brief

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of total estimated operating revenue: 1996</th>
<th>Total: $238.1 billion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-distance service</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local service</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network access</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cellular &amp; other radiotelephone</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directory advertising</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


California Leads in Manufacturing Jobs, Almost Twice the Number in Ohio or Texas

Nearly 2 million people were employed in manufacturing in California in 1996, almost twice as many as runners-up Ohio (1.1 million) and Texas (1.1 million).

Wyoming (9,700), the District of Columbia (12,800) and Alaska (15,800) had the fewest employees in manufacturing industries.


Contact:
Julius Smith
301-457-4741
<julius.smith.jr@ccmail.census.gov>

Rockets’ Red Glare

When President Clinton toured China this summer, he saw many firework displays – a fitting entertainment in the land where fireworks originated.

The fireworks the rest of us saw on the Fourth also may have come from the People’s Republic. U.S. imports of fireworks totaled $93 million in 1997; about 91 percent ($85 million) came from China.

The United States exported $6 million worth of fireworks, with Canada ($2.5 million) the leading destination.

## U.S. Statistics at a Glance

### Economic Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Latest data</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Latest month</th>
<th>Percent change from previous month</th>
<th>Previous month</th>
<th>Last year</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail: Sales</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>$Bil.</td>
<td>224.6</td>
<td>222.6</td>
<td>210.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>$Bil.</td>
<td>330.5</td>
<td>329.2</td>
<td>319.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inv./sales ratio</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>(X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer installment credit</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>$Bil.</td>
<td>1,252.1</td>
<td>1,251.7</td>
<td>1,209.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant wholesalers: Sales</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>$Bil.</td>
<td>214.0</td>
<td>213.6</td>
<td>207.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>$Bil.</td>
<td>275.8</td>
<td>277.6</td>
<td>259.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock/sales ratio</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>(X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction and Housing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential: Building permits – AR</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,545</td>
<td>1,517</td>
<td>1,432</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing starts – AR</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,530</td>
<td>1,541</td>
<td>1,404</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New home sales – AR</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New home mortgage rate – NSA</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>Pct.</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>8.01</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New construction: Total expenditures – AR</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>$Bil.</td>
<td>633.5</td>
<td>643.4</td>
<td>610.8</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current dollars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant (1992) dollars</td>
<td></td>
<td>$Bil.</td>
<td>526.1</td>
<td>534.7</td>
<td>516.3</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manufacturing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durable goods: Shipments</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>$Bil.</td>
<td>186.8</td>
<td>187.1</td>
<td>175.9</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New orders</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>$Bil.</td>
<td>184.5</td>
<td>189.1</td>
<td>176.4</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total goods:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipments</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>$Bil.</td>
<td>335.5</td>
<td>336.8</td>
<td>323.6</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventories</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>$Bil.</td>
<td>461.6</td>
<td>461.1</td>
<td>443.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inv./ship ratio</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>(X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of industrial production</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>1992=100</td>
<td>128.8</td>
<td>128.2</td>
<td>119.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.S. International Trade in Goods and Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exports of goods and services</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>$Bil.</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade balance</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>$Bil.</td>
<td>-14.5</td>
<td>-13.2</td>
<td>-8.1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>77.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Money Supply, Prices, Interest Rates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money supply (M1)</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>$Bil.</td>
<td>1,078</td>
<td>1,081</td>
<td>1,064</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Price Index – NSA</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>1982-84=100</td>
<td>162.5</td>
<td>162.2</td>
<td>160.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producer Price Index(^1)</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>1982=100</td>
<td>130.0</td>
<td>129.7</td>
<td>131.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prime rate charged by banks(^2)</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>Pct.</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-month U.S. T-bill – NSA</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>Pct.</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Principal Indicators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian labor force</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>Mil.</td>
<td>137.4</td>
<td>137.4</td>
<td>136.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>-10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of leading indicators</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>1992=100</td>
<td>105.2</td>
<td>105.2</td>
<td>103.5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal income – AR</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>$Bil.</td>
<td>7,223</td>
<td>7,185</td>
<td>6,823</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures are seasonally adjusted except as noted. Unless otherwise noted, all amounts are in current dollars as of the reference year.

Other Principal Indicators:
- Civilian labor force
- Unemployment rate
- Index of leading indicators
- Personal income – AR

Chained (1992) dollars:
- Gross domestic product (GDP)
- Personal consumption expenditures
- Gross private domestic investment

Note: Figures are seasonally adjusted except as noted. Unless otherwise noted, all amounts are in current dollars as of the reference year.

**Sources:** Census Bureau, Federal Reserve Board, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bureau of Economic Analysis, Bureau of the Census.
Lawsuit Challenges Sampling

Continued from page 1

Survey, to correct for errors in the initial census count. Doing so will yield, according to the Census Bureau and the National Academy of Sciences, a more accurate count than will traditional methods alone.

Lawyers for the U.S. House of Representatives argued that Congress and the Clinton Administration had reached an impasse on the question of whether sampling can be used in the census, making it necessary for the courts to step in.

Both sides presented their arguments on the constitutionality and legality of sampling methods.

The government said that the Constitution calls for the most accurate census possible, while the House’s lawyers argued that the term “enumeration” in Article I, Section 2, meant to count, not to estimate.

The House’s lawyers also argued that the Census Act (Title 13 of the U.S. Code) does not allow the use of sampling to produce the census counts used to apportion the House of Representatives.

They pointed to Section 195 of the Census Act, which states that except for purposes of apportionment, the Census Bureau “shall use sampling methods” whenever possible.

The government’s attorneys countered that Section 141 of the Census Act authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to determine how the census will be taken, including when to use sampling.

They suggested that when Congress amended both sections in 1976, it intended to encourage the use of sampling whenever possible in data collection activities but to leave the decision on whether to use sampling in the decennial census to the secretary.

The court also heard brief arguments in support of the government’s position from intervening parties, among them the city of Los Angeles, whose lawyers spoke on behalf of 19 other cities, counties and states.

The other lawsuit, Glavin v. Clinton, will be heard by a three-judge panel in the Eastern District of Virginia (Alexandria) later this summer.

In the Census Bureau’s funding bill for this year, Congress directed that the courts expedite consideration of the cases, so any appeal would go directly to the Supreme Court.