

111TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 1588

To ensure that an employer has the freedom to implement English in the workplace policies.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 18, 2009

Mr. PRICE of Georgia (for himself, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BARTLETT, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. HELLER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. JONES, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. McHENRY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PETRI, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. WOLF) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor

A BILL

To ensure that an employer has the freedom to implement English in the workplace policies.

- 1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
- 2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
- 3 **SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**
- 4 This Act may be cited as the “Common Sense
- 5 English Act”.

1 **SEC. 2. FINDINGS.**

2 Congress finds that—

3 (1) throughout the history of the United States,
4 English has been the common thread to unify the
5 American people much as they are united under one
6 flag;7 (2) Americans overwhelmingly believe that it is
8 very important for people living in the United States
9 to speak and understand English;10 (3) there is vast support among the American
11 people to allow a company the freedom to implement
12 English in the workplace policies; and13 (4) when a group of employees speaks a lan-
14 guage other than English in the workplace, it may
15 cause misunderstandings, create dangerous cir-
16 cumstances, and undermine morale.17 **SEC. 3. REQUIREMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE PERMIS-
18 SIBLE.**19 Section 703 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42
20 U.S.C. 2000e-2) is amended by adding at the end the fol-
21 lowing:22 “(o) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title,
23 it shall not be an unlawful employment practice for an
24 employer to require employees to speak English while en-
25 gaged in work.”.