

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 uses 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 make sure that the subcategories, 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 descent, it is totally different than someone from Puerto Rico or the Dominican Republic or from Colombia. That is just the way it is. But this is America today, and that is the reality.

So what does this amendment really seek to do? I do not believe, as has been characterized in the debate today, that it attempts to change any of the information. What we are asking is to take existing information and, from that, glean and analyze and come up with a better result. This is not a major overhaul, a wholesale overhaul of information, and no one should misinterpret it that way.

The amendment requires the Bureau of the Census to report to Congress on possible adjustments to the data and a diagnosis of how many people may have been misclassified by the rewriting of the census form. With these reports, we can determine how best to use the data we have and how we can avoid such confusion in the future.

What I am afraid of, and it has been mischaracterized and, again, I do not think intentionally, I think everyone questions everybody's motives when we come up and want to do something with this information. We are looking at accuracy. We are looking at the usefulness of the information. Otherwise, we may have the numbers, we may have succeeded in identifying more people and having more people respond to the census, but it will be of no use. We will not be able to use that information. We must identify those contributions that certain individuals can make within the Hispanic community but, more importantly, what are the needs of these individuals that reside in this great Nation of ours.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Maloney-Rangel amendment to improve the accuracy of the Hispanic census count.

Compared to the 1990 census, the 2000 census changed the way it asked Hispanics to identify their country of origin. In both censuses, individuals were asked to identify their Hispanic origin as Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, or other. The way the "other" category was treated is what changed. In both 1990 and 2000, those who marked other were asked to write in a particular group. In 1990, after "other," the questionnaire listed "Print one group, for example: Argentinian, Colombian, Dominican, Nicaraguan, Salvadorian, Spaniard, and so on." In 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 Chairman 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 gentleman 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 gentleman 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, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R.

2500) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

FURTHER LIMITATION ON AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2500, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 2500 in the Committee of the Whole, pursuant to House Resolution 192 and the order of the House of July 17, 2001, each amendment shall not be subject to amendment (except that the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or a designee, each may offer one pro forma amendment for the purpose of further debate on any pending amendment); 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.

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 192 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2500.

□ 1411

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2500) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and