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Let me explain why. It is important to identify the different groups within the Latino and Hispanic communities. Did the census succeed in doing so? The answer is no. Was it intentional? Was it negligence? It does not matter. The result is that we do not have an accurate result.

When we do not have an accurate result, we do not have usable information. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) knows exactly what I am talking about because I think we see eye to eye on 90 percent of the issues when it comes to the census. One of the issues is accuracy, but the other was the utilitarian part of it, and that is how we use this information.

It is not just the United States Government and every level of government under the Federal Government that has used it, but it is the private sector, trying to identify the needs of certain communities within the big, all-encompassing Hispanic community in the United States. Therefore, it is important to identify that the categories, the subgroups are identified, because the needs are truly different.

No one understands that, when I try to tell individuals, we are not just Latinos. If you take someone of Mexican, Cuban, or other the category, the way the category was treated is what changed. In both 1990 and 2000, those who marked other were only given the instruction “Print group.” The result of this was that far fewer people who marked “other” wrote in a group, and the count of groups like Colombians and Dominicans is understated in the 2000 census.

The Maloney-Rangel amendment will enable the Census Bureau to conduct a report on what the census results would have likely been, had the question been phrased the same way it was in 1990. This will provide us with useful, supplemental information about the Hispanic population.

The Hispanic community is becoming increasingly diverse. Having accurate information about the diversity of the Hispanic population will enable us to better target resources that are culturally sensitive to these communities. It is important to remember that the Hispanic community is not homogeneous. For example, the best way to communicate and reach out to Mexican-Americans is not the same as the best, most effective way to reach out to Dominican-Americans. This is why we should enable the Census Bureau to conduct a study and provide the public with information that gives us a better understanding of the true diversity within the Hispanic community.

Hispanics deserve to be accurately counted. As Chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, I therefore support the Maloney-Rangel amendment and urge all my colleagues to do the same.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) will be postponed.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida) having assumed the Chair, read the numbers of the House, and amendments numbered 1, 8, 19, 36, 34, 5, 33, 38, 17, 20, 22, 24, 25, 35, 10, 11, and 40 shall be debatable only for 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, reserving my right to object, and I will not object; we certainly worked this out and I am fine with it, this side is fine with it. I just wanted to clarify one point.

This covers, obviously, these amendments; and all other amendments then are still under the 5-minute rule, under the original rule.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that is correct.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.