

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. Obliging 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 Mofey 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, Chican 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

federal funds, including "a federally assisted zoo or theater . . . to take reasonable steps to provide meaningful opportunities for access" by Limited English Proficient (LEP) individuals.

How will Executive Order 13166 be enforced? The Maine Medical Center, based in Portland, now has nine official tongues and counting, thanks to a settlement with the Department of Health and Human Services' Office of Civil Rights.

The Maine Medical Center is now required to post a "Interpreter Availability Sign" to be "printed at least in English, Farsi, Khmer, Russian, Serbo-Croatian (Cyrillic and Roman alphabets), Somali, Spanish and Vietnamese."

In addition, hospital personnel must be "inform[ed] that MMC's policy of providing in-person and telephone interpreter services to LEP (Limited English Proficient) persons is not limited to languages in which [the Interpreter Availability Sign] and other documents are printed." In other words, anyone who arrives at the front desk of the Maine Medical Center now has the right to insist on a translation into any language in the world.

Mr. Speaker, allow me to turn next to the question of bilingual education, which the voters of my state abolished in June of 1998.

Thanks to the passage of Proposition 227, more California children are learning English and getting ready to take their rightful place in American society.

On August 20, 2000 the New York Times carried a story in its front page entitled: "Increase in Test Scores Counters Dire Forecasts for Bilingual Ban." The story began:

Two years after Californians voted to end bilingual education and force a million Spanish-speaking students to immerse themselves in English . . . those students are improving in reading and other subjects at often striking rates, according to standardized test scores released this week. . . . The results are remarkable given predictions that scores of Spanish-speaking students would plummet.

Consider the experience of Ken Noonan, who . . . founded the California Association of Bilingual Educators 30 years ago . . . [he] warned in 1998 that children newly arrived from Mexico and Central America would stop coming to school if they were not gradually weaned off Spanish in traditional bilingual classes.

Now, he says he was wrong.

"I thought it would hurt kids," Mr. Noonan said of the ballot initiative, which was called Proposition 227. "The exact reverse occurred, totally unexpected by me. The kids began to learn—not pick up, but learn—formal English, oral and written, far more quickly than I ever thought they would."

There was more good news. While 29% of the state's limited English proficient students were enrolled in bilingual education programs prior to the passage of Prop. 227, the percentage dropped to 12% after the proposition was implemented. "Even in the classrooms that had been designated as bilingual . . . teachers reveled that . . . their students were receiving much less literacy instruction in their primary language."

All this means that more California children of immigrants are being taught English. And test scores show they are learning it. Especially in the lower elementary grades, students who arrived at school speaking little or no English have made dramatic improvement in reading and mathematics.

Mr. Speaker, these facts support making English America's official language. Let me now turn to the underlying message of this legislation. Opponents of official English claim legislation of this sort sends the wrong message to Hispanic Americans. They are wrong, as Hispanic Americans from all walks of life are quick to reply.

The real message underlying this legislation was well-expressed by Everett Alvarez, Jr., who led the Republican Convention in the Pledge of Allegiance earlier this year.

Everett Alvarez was the first American pilot shot down in Vietnam. Everett Alvarez is also a proud American of Hispanic descent. In his book, *Code of Conduct*, Alvarez said, "I didn't spend eight-and-one-half years of my life as a prisoner of war because I was Hispanic. I didn't get beat up because I was Hispanic. I was an American fighting man." Alvarez also had this to say about bilingual education:

I am proud of being living proof that America is a country in which a person can overcome economic disadvantages and ethnic stereotypes. . . . I believe that education is the key to a successful and happy life in an open society. With that in mind, I oppose the movement to make Spanish (or any other foreign tongue) a second coequal language in American schools. This is a hindrance rather than a help to the young people who will eventually have to make their way in an English-speaking society.

Ernesto Ortiz, a South Texas ranch hand echoed this view. As quoted by John Silber, in his book *Straight Shooting*: "My children learn in Spanish in school so they can grow up to be busboys and waiters. I teach them in English at home so they can grow up to be doctors and lawyers."

Alvarez and Ortiz are joined by Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., who so eloquently spoke in his book, *The Disuniting of America*, of how: "a common language is a necessary bond of national cohesion in so heterogeneous a nation as America. . . . [I]nstitutionalized bilingualism remains another source of the fragmentation of America, another threat to the dream of 'one people.'"

The vision which underlies my English Language Amendment is the uniquely American vision of a nation of immigrants united by a common tongue. This is not only the popular position—official English has won handily in my home state of California—is also the right position.

If passed by the Congress and ratified by the states, my English Language Amendment will provide permanent protection from the divisions and dangers of mandatory multilingualism. It is for this reason that I hope Congress will choose this particular approach, though it is a longer and harder road than simple legislation. This nation of immigrants needs a common tongue.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the English Language Amendment.

COALITION FOR AUTISM RESEARCH AND EDUCATION (C.A.R.E.) CAUCUS

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 2001

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today I joined with Rep. MIKE DOYLE of Penn-

sylvania and over 60 other Members of the House to introduce a new congressional caucus concerning autism called C.A.R.E., which stands for the Coalition for Autism Research and Education.

As I have said many times before, the parents of children with autism are truly the voices of the voiceless. They are the protectors of those who cannot fend for themselves. For some years now, we have been working to provide help to the parents. But today we have reinforcements. Today we launch a new vehicle through which we can all work towards our common goals.

The Coalition for Autism Research and Education (C.A.R.E.) is a bipartisan Congressional Member Organization (CMO) dedicated to improving research, education, and support services for persons with autism spectrum disorders. I am very proud to be a Co-Chairman of this new organization, and pleased to be working alongside my good friend, and Democrat colleague, MIKE DOYLE of Pennsylvania (PA-18).

At today's press conference we were also honored to have a special guest, Mr. B.J. Surhoff, a professional baseball player who plays left field for the Atlanta Braves. Many of us know B.J. for his skill and grace on the baseball field. But few of us know that of all the challenges and accomplishments he has faced in his life, probably none are more near and dear to his heart than his son, Mason, who is autistic.

I have always believed that the true value of any society can be seen in how it treats its most vulnerable members. And few are as vulnerable and dependent on others as the autistic child.

A key mission of C.A.R.E. is to expand federal research for autism. The caucus will be working hard to build upon a proven record of accomplishments in the area of autism research during the previous 106th Congress.

During the 106th Congress, we passed landmark legislation which established "Centers of Excellence" to track cases of autism, increased funding at the Center for Disease Control (CDC) from \$1.1 million in Fiscal Year 2000 to \$6.7 million in FY 2001 and boosted funding at the National Institute of Health (NIH) from \$40 million in FY 1999 to \$45 million in 2000. Another significant increase in autism funding is expected at NIH for FY 2001. Congress also held hearings on autism, which have led to a better understanding of the disorder.

Many of my colleagues who I worked with last year on these issues are enthusiastic members of C.A.R.E., including, Dr. DAVE WELDON of Florida, Chairman DAN BURTON of Indiana, and Congressman JIM GREENWOOD of Pennsylvania.

I am extremely proud of the work we did last Congress. The enactment of Title I of the Children's Health Act (P.L. 106-310) on October 17, which incorporated provisions of two bills JIM GREENWOOD and I introduced—HR 274 and HR 997—were a major feat for autism research.

Title I of this legislation, among other things, authorized the creation of 3 "Centers of Excellence" in autism epidemiology to conduct prevalence and incidence data on autism. In this way, scientists can get a better understanding of the scope of CDC and would specialize in a specific aspect of autism research. In addition, the centers would provide education on the best methods of diagnosis and