

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of House Resolution 133, which provides interim funding for the standing select committees of the House from April 1, 2005, through April 30, 2005. The rules of the House provide interim funding for committees until March 31 of 2005. This resolution will extend that funding for an additional month, thereby allowing the Committee on House Administration the time needed to put together the committee funding resolution that will, once passed, fund the committees for the duration of the 109th Congress.

This is nothing unusual. We have done this in the past. The committee chairmen and ranking members will appear Thursday of this week and the following Wednesday to present their budget requests to the committee, and that will be all the committee Chairs.

As the House will be out of session for the final 2 weeks of March for the Easter district work period, floor consideration of the committee funding resolution really will not be practical or possible, therefore, before March 31; and, therefore, it necessitates passage of this interim funding resolution. That is why we are here today. I therefore urge my colleagues to support resolution 133; it is needed.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished gentleman from Ohio in supporting House Resolution 133, providing interim funding for standing and select committees of the House through April 30, 2005.

As most chairmen and ranking members know, funding for House committees would expire March 31 without this resolution.

□ 1415

I would like to thank the chairman for ensuring the committees will have the resources to continue operating while the Committee on House Administration processes their funding requests for the 109th Congress.

President Woodrow Wilson from my home State of New Jersey said it well when he said here on the floor, "Congress in session is Congress on public exhibition, whilst Congress in its committee rooms is Congress at work."

Yes, we have to keep the committees going, and I support the chairman in this effort. The Committee on House Administration's ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD), who is returning from her district, has asked me to stand in for her and asked me to specifically relay that she is looking forward to working with the chairman on hearings this week and next week. She is especially keen to ensure that in this Congress committee minorities will receive at least one-third of all committee resources.

Now, I, speaking as a member of the Commission on Congressional Mailing Standards, which is commonly known

as the Franking Commission, am concerned about problems with the increased abuse of the frank by one or more committee chairs for blatantly, I would have to say, blatantly political purposes. And I am hopeful that the Committee on House Administration will address this issue through the upcoming Committee Funding Resolution and take appropriate action to stop any such abuses.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for supporting this resolution today and also look forward to working with the Congresswoman and ranking member.

When the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) chaired the Committee on House Administration, he pushed towards the one-third and always provided one-third at that time to the ranking member, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER). We have kept in that tradition, together with the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) and also with the current ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD). I am very happy to say that last session, with the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), we achieved the two-thirds/one-third, and we need to continue to do that. And I think that is the only fair way, and we need to evaluate how the two-thirds and one-third is split.

Again, with the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), we did that. It was a great achievement that was started by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS).

As far as the issue of the committees, although I do not see any abuse that has occurred, as far as retooling the rules and regs of the House, we are always willing to sit and talk about that.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would say many Americans wonder why the resources for the committees are not divided one-half/one-half. Well, they should understand that it is traditional, now that the majority party would have most of the committee staff, most of the committee resources, and so two-thirds/one-third division has become traditional and that is what the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is hoping to achieve. I thank the chairman for his consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 133, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 133.

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

There was no objection.

#### SUPPORTING THE DESIGNATION OF A YEAR OF LANGUAGES

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 122) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the study of languages and supporting the designation of a Year of Languages.

The Clerk read as follows:

##### H. RES. 122

Whereas the people of the United States have growing social, cultural, and economic ties to the international community that present new challenges as the United States seeks to communicate with and understand international partners from different language and cultural backgrounds;

Whereas communities across the United States are welcoming many new neighbors, friends, employees, and citizens from many countries throughout the world;

Whereas increased language learning is a critical national interest and is necessary to maintain the economic edge the United States has in the worldwide marketplace;

Whereas developing a workforce that is skilled in languages and cultural understanding is vital for conducting international commerce;

Whereas both the 2000 Cox Commission and the National Intelligence Council have reported that a shortfall of experts in foreign languages, particularly the languages of Asia and the Middle East, has seriously hampered information gathering and analysis within the intelligence community of the United States;

Whereas studying other languages has been shown to contribute to increased cognitive skills, better academic performance, and a greater understanding of others, while also providing life-long learning opportunities;

Whereas language education in the 21st century includes a commitment to the study of long sequences of world languages, beginning in early grades and continuing throughout the academic career of an individual, in order to develop the levels of proficiency needed to effectively communicate with people from other cultures at home and abroad; and

Whereas the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, along with

its affiliate organizations, is urging the public to support increased language education for students, which will expand the cultural and literary horizons of adult learners and strengthen the position and security of the United States throughout the world: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) the study of languages contributes to the intellectual and social development of a student and the economy and security of the United States;

(2) there should be a Year of Languages in the United States, during which language study is promoted and expanded in elementary schools, secondary schools, institutions of higher education, businesses, and government programs; and

(3) the President should issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to—

(A) encourage and support initiatives to promote and expand the study of languages; and

(B) observe a Year of Languages with appropriate ceremonies, programs, and other activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 122.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 122. This resolution expresses the importance of foreign language study and supports the designation of a Year of Languages. Increased language learning is a critical national interest and is necessary to maintain the economic edge of the United States as well as serving to better secure our national interest abroad.

Currently, 9.3 percent of Americans speak their native language and another language fluently, compared to 52.7 percent of Europeans.

Foreign language education has long been determined to increase a student's cognitive and critical thinking abilities. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act names foreign language study as a part of a core curriculum, and the Higher Education Act denotes that foreign language study is vital to secure the future economic welfare of the United States. Therefore, language education in our Nation's schools should begin in early grades and continue throughout the student's entire academic career.

By designating a Year of Languages, this Congress highlights the importance of foreign languages and cultural understanding in our schools, our workforces and our society. The celebration of languages will serve as a

look to the future for Americans who will be entering the workforce at a time when international understanding, cross-cultural awareness and linguistic capacity are increasingly important for their success in the world.

In light of the attacks of September 11, 2001, the American intelligence community stresses that individuals with proper foreign language expertise are greatly needed to work on important national security and foreign policy issues. As we enter into a time that requires an increased understanding of world cultures, foreign language study and requisite knowledge in languages is vital for meeting 21st century security challenges properly, effectively and efficiently.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak at some length about this because it is really so important to our country. I would like to thank the leadership for allowing us to bring up this resolution which expresses the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the study of languages and supporting the designation of a Year of Languages. I would like to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI) for co-sponsoring the resolution.

Under the guidance and guardianship of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 2005 will be celebrated as the Year of Languages in the United States. These celebrations will take place in a variety of settings including elementary and secondary schools and post-secondary institutions as well as at events at local and State and national levels across America. It is an opportunity to focus on America's need to focus our attention on the social and economic benefits of studying other languages and cultures around the world and on the importance of these studies to our national security.

This initiative will seek to influence the full range of language programs in the United States schools and communities, and I think the campaign plan will capture the attention and, I hope, the interest of all Americans with the involvement and assistance of teachers, administrators and local officials. If the United States is going to continue to play an important role in the global economy and in the business world and to be the leader politically, and I would say militarily, we must be able to understand and communicate with other cultures around the world.

According to a 2002 survey from Healthy Companies International, the average number of languages spoken by American business executives is less than one and a half, compared with say 3.9 languages spoken on average by business executives in the Netherlands.

The goals of the Year of Languages are four: To expand the public's understanding of the role of language in all

aspects of people's lives, in society and in the future of human and international relations; to promote the importance of language learning and language proficiency, urging every American to commit to learning other languages; to build awareness of the diversity of languages that now play an integral part of everyday life in our country; and to promote the formation of a national task force to study and strengthen national policy on language learning and teaching and to make recommendations to strengthen U.S. policy.

Some members of the public and the media might question why, with our unparalleled military and economic power, Americans need to learn languages of the world. Does not everyone speak English anyway? So they say.

Well, the reasons to launch a government-wide effort to build a pipeline of professionals with advanced foreign language capabilities, I think, should be self-evident to Americans. Let me quote a statement. "The United States today carries new responsibilities in many quarters of the globe, and we are at a serious disadvantage because of the difficulty of finding persons who can deal with the foreign language problems."

Those are not my words. Those are the words of former U.S. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, spoken in 1953. What was true in the post-World War II world of 1953 is even more true in the post-9/11 world of 2004 and 2005.

Our national deficiency in the languages and cultures of critical areas around the world is compromising American security interests. And in addition to diminishing our opportunities economically and culturally, the deficiency is making our troops overseas more vulnerable and, I would argue, the American people less safer.

A few years after John Foster Dulles spoke these words, Russia launched a small beeping sphere above the Earth known as Sputnik. Americans were shocked, even fearful, and Congress, saying America would never be caught flat-footed again, passed the National Defense Education Act in 1958 that did much to overhaul the teaching of science and math and also provided some assistance for the study of languages.

September 11, 2001, was also a wake-up call for us. If we fail to address one of the most serious problems facing our Nation, we will not have risen to the challenge of September 11, 2001. The 9/11 joint inquiry reported a year and a half ago that our intelligence community is at 30 percent readiness in languages critical to national security. A State Department commissioned report from a year ago found that our government has only 54, or at that time, only 54 genuine Arabic speakers working in the entire Foreign Service.

A year or so ago, I asked David Kay, the former head of the Iraq Survey Group, how many on his 1,400 member team spoke Arabic and understood the

technology of weapons of mass destruction. Well, he said he could count on the fingers of one hand.

I posed similar questions to some members of the special forces who had been combing the mountains of Afghanistan looking for Osama bin Laden. I asked how many of them spoke Pushtu. Well, they responded, they had picked some up during the year they had been there. Although our special forces represent some of the best trained forces in the world, we are clearly not giving them the skills they need. If Osama bin Laden is truly American public enemy number one, how do we expect to track him down if we cannot speak the languages of the people who are hiding him?

As Dr. David Chu, the U.S. Undersecretary of Defense, said in his opening remarks at the National Language Conference last June, we need “a permanent change in our approach to the peoples and cultures of the rest of the world.”

□ 1430

Our need to understand the world is a prime national security concern.

He went on, “National security concerns have taken us from the streets of Manhattan to the mountains of Afghanistan and to the resort cities of Bali. Our economy has brought workers here to America and sent jobs to 100 countries around the world. Our health is affected by conditions and events in China, Britain, Africa and South America. Criminal cartels and corrupt officials hundreds of miles beyond our borders have an immediate impact on our streets, in our schools and our homes. Within one generation, we have become integrated into the world as never before.” Those are the words of the Undersecretary of Defense Dr. Chu.

While the Defense Department, the State Department and our intelligence agencies have recently turned their attention to the language problem, their approach remains focused on immediate needs. They are stepping up recruitment efforts, and they are expanding the language education programs in Monterey, here in Washington and elsewhere, and these are promising and necessary changes, but they only scratch the surface.

They do not deal with the problem of the pool. From what pool will they be recruiting the linguists for the Defense Department, the State Department, our intelligence agencies?

The root of the problem, I think, is in our schools. If we are to address adequately the language shortage in the Federal Government, we have to look past the issues of immediate recruitment and foreign language training. Federal language schools are building on a poor language foundation. We must design and implement a Federal language strategy that begins at the earliest years of education and continues through college.

Mr. Speaker, consider the following facts: Al Qaeda and similar terrorist

elements operate in over 75 countries where hundreds of languages and dialects are spoken. However, 99 percent of American high school, college and university programs concentrate on a few, mostly European, languages. According to figures from a couple of years ago, 2002, more college students study Ancient Greek than Arabic, Korean, Persian, Pashto and a number of other languages put together. Nothing against Ancient Greek, but certainly it is an important area of study, but the shortage of training in Arabic, Korean, Persian, Pashto and a long list of others should be cause for concern.

Out of 1.3 million graduates at America's colleges and universities, 17, two years ago, earned a bachelor's or advanced degree in Arabic, according to the Department of Education, 17. In Chinese, the language spoken by billions of people, 217 degrees were granted, according to the Department of Education. That is compared with almost 3,000 in French, more than 8,000 in Spanish. We need to improve not just the number of degrees but the quality of education throughout the educational years.

In addition to the resolution before us today, I have introduced the National Security Language Act, legislation that would expand the Federal investment in education in foreign languages of critical need. It would provide Federal incentives for high school students to study languages in college. It would give universities resources to expand language programs overseas, and it would identify Americans with preexisting language abilities for recruitment.

The bill would create an international flagship language initiative that would provide Federal grants to specific universities and colleges to establish high-quality, intensive, in-country language study programs in countries around the world. It would establish a science and technology advanced language grant program for institutions of higher education to establish programs that encourage students to develop foreign language proficiency as they study science, engineering and other technologies.

The bill would provide loan forgiveness of up to \$10,000 for undergraduate students in foreign languages. It would encourage early northern language studies by establishing grants for foreign language partnerships between local districts and foreign language departments at institutes of higher education.

It would create a commission of national study of foreign language heritage and a Federal marketing campaign to identify heritage communities with native speakers of critical foreign languages and market to them the need to pursue the study of languages.

I believe the next step then would be to increase the supply line of students who have strong language skills, and this can only be done through the K-through-12 system. The Council for

Basic Education recently released a study. Foreign language instruction experienced decreases in instruction time as reported by principals, particularly in high minority schools. Whereas in low minority schools, 9 percent of the principals reported a decrease in time spent studying languages; 11 percent reported an increase. But in minority schools, schools with a high proportion of minority students, there was a 23 percent decline in instructional time, with only 9 percent of the principals reporting an increase. In other words, this is also a matter of our educational divide in this country.

In addition to developing a lifelong ability to communicate with people from other countries and backgrounds, other benefits include improved overall school performance and improved problem solving skills. Students of foreign languages tend to score higher on standardized tests. And results from the Scholastic Aptitude Test show that students who had studied a foreign language for 4 or more years outscored other students on the verbal and math portions of the test. This is according to the college board SAT as reported in 2003.

Knowledge of a second language also seems to coincide with high academic achievement. It is not just whether a school has a rigorous program, although certainly that helps, but time spent in studying foreign languages means that students earn better grades in college and are less likely to drop out.

There are all sorts of reasons to study foreign languages, and studying the language, learning a language at any age is beneficial. Some studies have shown that the brain is more open to linguistic development in the early years. I have certainly seen that in my own grandchildren and children. When children have an early start to a long sequence of language instruction that continues through high school and college, they will be, studies have shown, able to achieve levels of fluency in that and to pick up other languages. Nevertheless, older children and adults can still be successful at learning a second or third or fourth language. Although the level of attainment is a little more predictable for us older learners, it is still worth doing.

In 1958, as I said, Congress responded to Sputnik by passing the National Defense Education Act. It focused on science and engineering and, to some extent, on languages. Immediately after September 11, Americans found themselves once again facing a Sputnik moment. Americans realized that we were caught flatfooted and unprepared to deal with not just hatred around the world but hatred that was turned into vicious attacks.

We need a national commitment to languages on a scale of the NDEA, the National Defense Education Act, and Mr. Speaker, I think today's resolution that will, among other things, recognize 2005 as the year of languages is a

start toward making that commitment.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the time remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN). The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS), my colleague.

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 122.

For years, we have known that, to be competitive in the world, Americans must acquire the language capacity to speak with our counterparts. Personally, for myself, when my husband was stationed in Japan during the Vietnam War, we lived in a Japanese community, and with my toddler and baby there, I learned some minimal Japanese so that I could speak with and spend time with my neighbors in a way that was really meaningful to both of us. We became friends, and the importance of language study became so real to me in those days.

In San Diego, we are keenly aware that so many of our residents are bilingual. Indeed, in our schools, students come from homes where English is not spoken. Over a hundred languages are represented in our schools.

As a school board member, I have worked hard to develop better training of foreign language instructors and to bring in more initiatives that recognize the diverse languages in our schools, but I must say that that issue really did not progress nearly as much as I would like, and in fact, today, we still have issues around certifying teachers in many different languages.

Critically, we are also so aware that our service members must be equipped with even the basic ability to speak with the citizens of Iraq and with the citizens of Afghanistan. So I am proud that our service personnel in Camp Pendleton are now being given that very introductory language instruction from our higher education institutions.

It is clearly appropriate that we establish a year of languages to focus on the importance of developing proficiency in a language other than English, and it must be a strong initiative that we bring forward. It will only be meaningful, however, if we only move forward and we develop a kind of strategic plan so that we find the resources, and more than anything, we find the will to make foreign language development an integral part of our daily lives.

I salute my colleague for bringing this forward. I thank him very much because I think it has to be the kind of initiative that goes beyond many of

our dreams for this area. It must have the kind of applicability that says this is important to us; this is important to our country.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I am delighted to hear that my colleague has studied Japanese.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues pass this resolution and work with me on other language projects to see that we address this Sputnik moment that this country faces and that we work hard to address our poor, I would use that word, language proficiency here in the United States, for reasons of culture, for reasons of economics and for reasons of national security.

I urge the passage of H. Res. 122.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 122.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1445

#### APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO CANADA-UNITED STATES INTER-PARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN). Pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276d, and the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Canada-United States Interparliamentary group:

Mr. MANZULLO, Illinois, Chairman  
Mr. MCCOTTER, Michigan, Vice Chairman

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1832

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PUTNAM) at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

#### PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON H.R. 3, TRANSPORTATION EQUITY ACT: A LEGACY FOR USERS

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure may file a supplemental report on the bill, H.R. 3, to authorize funds for federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes, at any time before midnight, March 8, 2005.

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

There was no objection.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on approving the Journal, and on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Approval of the Journal, de novo.

House Resolution 133, by the yeas and nays.

House Resolution 122, by the yeas and nays.

The first and third electronic votes will be conducted as 15 minute votes. The second vote in this series will be a 5-minute vote.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the pending business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question is on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 378, nays 29, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 53]

YEAS—378

Abercrombie	Beauprez	Boehner
Ackerman	Becerra	Bonilla
Aderholt	Berman	Bonner
Akin	Berry	Bono
Alexander	Biggert	Boozman
Allen	Bilirakis	Boren
Andrews	Bishop (GA)	Boswell
Baca	Bishop (NY)	Boustany
Bachus	Bishop (UT)	Boyd
Baker	Blackburn	Bradley (NH)
Barrett (SC)	Blumenauer	Brady (TX)
Bartlett (MD)	Blunt	Brown (OH)
Barton (TX)	Boehlert	Brown (SC)