

and its efforts at cultivating a strong relationship with the West.

Mr. Speaker, Ukraine declared its independence from the Soviet Union in 1991, and since then has embarked on a long march towards democracy. Along the way, it has gradually oriented itself towards the West and embraced Western institutions. Ukraine was the first post-Soviet state to join NATO's Partnership for Peace program. It has since become party to a NATO-Ukraine Commission, which meets at various times throughout the year, and is a member of the Council of Europe. Ukraine has stated that its strategic goal is integration into Western political and security structures, including, potentially, NATO itself.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to express support for Ukraine's Prime Minister, Viktor Yushchenko, and his wife Katherine, who is American. Prime Minister Yushchenko has worked tirelessly to end corruption and carry out democratic reforms in Ukraine, recently under turmoil because of the undemocratic actions of others in power. His continued leadership will be critical to the success of this progressing nation.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION
ON REVISIONS TO THE PIC PROGRAM

HON. DONNA M. CHRISTENSEN

OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 2001

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce a bill which would make a series of technical and/or noncontroversial adjustments to the Production Incentive Certificate ("PIC") program for watch and jewelry produced in the U.S. insular possessions. In the near term, this legislation would improve the operation of the PIC program for both watch and jewelry manufacturers in the U.S. Virgin Islands—producers that provide a critical source of employment for the Territory. Over the longer term, this legislation would protect the PIC program and related duty incentives from the effects of any future reduction or elimination of watch tariffs.

The watch industry is the largest light manufacturing industry in the USVI and remains one of the most important direct and indirect sources of private sector employment in the Territory. The insular watch production industry is also highly import-sensitive and faces continued threats from multinational watch producers, who have continued to move their watch production to lower wage countries.

Congress and successive Administrations have recognized the importance of the watch industry to the USVI—and the import sensitivity of watches—through a series of significant enactments and decisions. The General Note 3(a) program, which Congress has incorporated in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule, grants duty-free treatment for qualifying insular possession watches and thereby provides a relative duty advantage vis-à-vis foreign watch producers. Through the PIC program, insular possession watch producers can obtain duty refunds based on creditable wages paid for watch production in the insular possessions. Additionally, in recognition of the relative advantage that duty-free treatment of watches provides to insular possession watch pro-

ducers, Congress and successive Administrations have resisted efforts to eliminate watch duties on a worldwide basis.

In 1999, Congress extended the General Note 3(a) program and PIC program benefits to jewelry produced in the insular possessions. In doing so, Congress sought to promote vital employment in the insular possessions by extending existing watch industry incentives to jewelry production—an industry which utilizes many of the same skills and facilities as watch production. Since enactment of this important change, four mainland jewelry manufacturing companies have established operations in the USVI and are participating in the PIC program.

Watch and jewelry producers in the Virgin Islands have consulted with the American Watch Association and U.S. watch firms that import substantial quantities of foreign made watches regarding proposals to preserve and protect benefits for insular possession watches and jewelry, while also mitigating the impact of any future reduction of duties on imported watches. These discussions have resulted in the parties' unified support for the legislation that I am introducing today.

The various technical adjustments set forth in this legislation would enhance the ability of insular watch and jewelry producers to utilize the PIC program while, at the same time, retaining overall PIC program unit and dollar value limits. Additionally, the legislation would establish a standby mechanism to mitigate the impact of any possible future reduction or elimination of watch duties on a worldwide basis through trade negotiations and congressional action. This mechanism—which has broad support among the insular and domestic watch manufacturing and distribution sectors—would ensure that any future reduction in watch duties does not disturb the relative value of current duty incentives and PIC program benefits for the insular watch industry. Importantly, this standby mechanism would have no effect on current watch duties or PIC program limits.

Under the PIC program, producers of watches and jewelry in the U.S. insular possessions are issued certificates by the Department of Commerce for specified percentages of the producer's verified creditable wages for production in the insular possessions. Based on these certificates, the producers are entitled to apply to the U.S. Customs Service for refunds on duties paid on watches. Certain technical provisions of the PIC program, however, impose unnecessary burdens on producers. These include unclear definitions, unduly complex PIC refund provisions and special issues relating to the extension of PIC benefits to jewelry. The legislation that I am introducing today includes technical adjustments to the PIC program to eliminate these burdens, while retaining overall PIC program limits on units and benefits.

Currently, a producer receives a single PIC certificate of entitlement for each calendar year, which is issued by March 1 of the following year. This certificate serves as the basis for the producer's application for duty refunds to U.S. Customs, a process which can take as long as six months. As a result, there can be delays of as long as 18 months between the time a producer incurs a creditable wage payment and the time the producer receives the related duty refund. The proposed legislation would reduce these unnecessary delays by providing for the issuance of PIC certificates of entitlement on a quarterly basis.

Currently, producers must assemble often voluminous import entry information and apply to U.S. Customs for wage-based refunds. If a producer has not paid sufficient import duties, the producer must sell the PIC certificate to another firm, which then applies for the duty refund. In either event, the PIC program assures that an insular producer is compensated for a specified percentage of its verified production wages, regardless of whether it has paid the corresponding amount of import duties. The bill would simplify this refund process by providing producers with the option of applying directly to the Treasury Department for the full amount of their verified PIC program certificates.

For watches, the PIC program establishes a 750,000 unit limitation on the number of watches used to calculate an individual producer's PIC benefits. When the PIC program was extended by Congress to jewelry, this upper limit was also extended to each individual jewelry producer's qualifying jewelry production. While this limit may be appropriate for watches, which are technically sophisticated and relatively expensive, I am informed that it is likely to unduly limit jewelry production in the insular possessions, which relies on large quantities of relatively lower-priced units. My proposed legislation would address this issue by eliminating the 750,000 unit per producer limit for jewelry, while retaining the overall unit and dollar value limits for the PIC program as a whole.

When Congress extended the PIC program to jewelry in 1999, it sought to encourage the phased establishment of new jewelry production in the insular possessions through a transition rule. Under this rule, jewelry items which are assembled (but not substantially transformed) in the insular possessions before August 9, 2001 would be eligible for PIC program and duty-free benefits. Although this new provision has helped attract new jewelry production to the USVI, I am informed that some potential producers are facing administrative, technical and business delays which may severely erode the benefits of the transition rule. The bill would address this issue by extending the transition rule for jewelry for an additional 18 months.

The bill would help to facilitate long term planning by existing insular producers and attract new producers to the insular possessions by extending the authorized term of the PIC program until 2015. The bill would also clarify current law by stating explicitly that verified wages include the amount of any fringe benefits.

For many years, multinational companies that import substantial quantities of foreign-made watches into the United States have sought to reduce or eliminate U.S. watch duties, either through multiple petitions for duty-free treatment for watches from certain GSP-eligible countries or through worldwide elimination of watch duties in trade negotiations. Insular possession watch producers have repeatedly opposed these efforts on the ground that the elimination of duties on foreign watches would eliminate the relative benefit that insular possession producers receive through duty-free treatment under the General Note 3 (a) program and, in turn, lead to the eventual demise of the insular watch industry. Successive Congresses and Administrations have agreed with these arguments and refused to erode the benefits which insular possession

producers receive under General Note 3(a) and the PIC program.

These continued battles over watch duties and the insular possession watch program have imposed significant resource burdens on Virgin Islands watch producers and the Government of the U.S. Virgin Islands, diverting resources and energy that could better be spent in enhancing growth and employment in the insular watch and jewelry industries. Virgin Islands watch producers, the AWA and representatives of U.S. firms that import foreign-made watches are seeking to address this longstanding issue by reconciling existing insular possession watch benefits with any worldwide reduction or elimination of watch duties. The legislation that I am introducing contains two mechanisms to help mitigate against the impact of any future reduction or elimination of watch duties, while also preserving existing watch benefits.

The bill would put in place a standby mechanism that would preserve the benefits of duty-free treatment under General Note 3(a) in the event that Congress and a future Administration were to agree at some future point to eliminate or reduce duties on watches. This mechanism would preserve the relative tariff advantage that insular producers currently enjoy over foreign-made watches by incorporating a "hold harmless" provision in the PIC program. Under this standby mechanism, if watch duties were reduced or eliminated in the future, PIC payments to insular producers would also include an amount which reflects the value to the insular producers of the current General Note 3(a) benefit. This mechanism would facilitate the eventual reduction or elimination of watch duties on a worldwide basis while helping to assure that any such duty reduction does not lead to the demise of the insular industry.

Currently, payments under the PIC program are funded from watch duties. An alternative funding source would be required if watch duties were reduced or eliminated on a worldwide basis. The legislation that I am introducing provides that PIC benefits can be funded from jewelry duties or duties on other appropriate products.

It is important to bear in mind that these two mechanisms would only be activated in the event that watch duties are, in fact, reduced or eliminated in the future—decisions that would require considerable deliberation and consultation by the President and Congress. By assuring the continuation of current benefits for insular producers, however, these mechanisms would greatly mitigate the impact of any eventual decision by Congress to reduce or eliminate watch duties.

Congress has long recognized that the current watch industry incentives are critical to the health and survival of the watch industry in the U.S. Virgin Islands. By adopting this legislation, Congress can improve the operation of the PIC program for insular watch and jewelry producers and establish a mechanism to facilitate the eventual reduction or elimination of watch duties on a worldwide basis.

FULL FUNDING FOR PELL GRANTS

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 2001

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Pell Grant Full Funding Act.

It is time we live up to our promise of providing students from low-income families access to higher education.

Although we promise eligible students a maximum Pell Grant award of \$5,100 for the 2001 school year, we only appropriated funding for a \$3,750 maximum award.

How can we renege on a promise to help fund a student's education? We must not impose artificial limits. If we really mean what we say about all students having access to a higher education, we should interpret the Pell Grant Program as an obligation which Congress is according based on strict eligibility standards. We do this with Medicare. We determine if a person is eligible and then we provide that individual with resources for hospitalization, for doctors care, and so forth. We do not tell the person they are eligible and then deny them the medical care when they show up at the hospital. We must not deny students funding for education when they show up at colleges. Obligating ourselves to fund what students are entitled to is the only way we are going to meet our fundamental responsibility to provide access to higher education for all students.

The Pell Grant Full Funding Act that does just that. It will create a contractual obligation on the United States to reimburse institutions that award Pell Grants to its eligible students in the full amount they are entitled to. Simply put, my bill guarantees that eligible students will receive the amount they are entitled to, making it easier to get a higher education.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to cosponsor this important legislation.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE AMENDMENT

HON. JOHN T. DOOLITTLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 2001

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct pleasure to reintroduce the English Language Amendment to the Constitution in the 107th Congress. I remain convinced that this nation of immigrants must once again be united under a common tongue.

The notion that our nation's government must function in multiple tongues may appear to be compassionate. Yet recent events once again demonstrate that this apparently compassionate solution is simply not helping the people it may have been intended to help.

The New York Times carried an urgent editorial on January 1st of this year, entitled "Bungled Ballots in Chinatown." The Times noted that "Chinese-language ballots were translated incorrectly. The 'Democratic' label was translated as 'Republican' and 'Republican' was rendered 'Democratic' for state races." In addition, the Chinese instructions for choosing State Supreme Court justices were also flawed. The English instruction read

"Vote for any THREE" candidates while the Chinese version asked voters to "Vote for any FIVE."

How could mistakes like this happen? A quick overview of a manual for prospective professional translators, *The Translator's Handbook* by Moffey Sofer, suggests that correctly interpreting between two languages is more difficult than some may suppose. There is variation within every language, as anyone who has compared American English with British English knows all too well.

In the case of Chinese, the language is presently written in both traditional and simplified characters and varies between the mainland and Taiwan. Sofer also notes that there are more problems translating between Spanish and English than between other languages and English because:

[T]here is no single variety of Spanish. There are major differences between the Spanish of Mexico, Central America, northern South America and [s]outhern South America, not to mention such places as Puerto Rico and . . . Spain.

Cuban Spanish, Puerto Rican Spanish, Chicanos Spanish and additional forms of Spanish all exist within the borders of the United States, creating vast potential for cross-cultural confusion. Thus, the English word "eyeglasses" must be translated as *anteojos* for one Hispanic community in the U.S., for another as *gafas*, while a third group prefers *espejuelos* and still another group refers to eyeglasses as *lentes*.

Spanish and Chinese aren't the only languages which create translation challenges. *The Translators Handbook* also notes that "there are several spoken Arabic dialects which are not always mutually intelligible, such as Syrian and Egyptian and . . . even the official written Arabic has different terms and uses in different Arab countries."

In fact, translation difficulties are part of the dispute in the Middle East. A July 24, 1999 letter to the New York Times notes that UN Resolution 242 reads in English that Israel is to return unspecified "territory" while the French version refers to "the territory" (*le territoire*).

These difficulties of translation underscore the practical problems inherent to multilingual government. Millions of official documents multiplied by a multitude of language translations mean a potential for massive errors.

Without an official language, there would be no legal standard to decide among competing translations of a government document in which the English version said one thing while the translation said something altogether different. My colleagues and I can spend hours negotiating over the exact wording of one phrase in one piece of legislation. We are all aware that wording matters.

Mr. Speaker, these practical problems are about to multiply exponentially, thanks to President Clinton's Executive Order 13166.

Executive Order 13166 received little media coverage when it was signed on August 11th, the last Friday before the Democratic Convention in Los Angeles. Executive Order 13166 will soon be major news with incalculable financial impact on every state, city and town.

Executive Order 13166 is based on belief that to provide services solely in English could "discriminate on the basis of national origin." Thus Clinton Executive Order 13166, as interpreted by the Office of Civil Rights in the Department of Justice, requires every recipient of