

awhile and see if people understand the origins of where their resentment comes from; but there is also allied with this a great deal of misunderstanding and misimpressions and a lack of information about what immigrants are all about.

I want to bring some attention to a study, a recent study, done by Prof. Alejandro Portes, of the Johns Hopkins University, and Ruben Rumbaut of Michigan State, who have recently concluded a study entitled "Growing up American: Dilemmas of the New Second Generation," which I believe refutes many, many of the misconceptions people have about immigrants.

One of the things that perhaps we need to bring to this debate about the role of immigrants in American society is certainly the role of language choice and language use by such immigrants in American society, in order to better inform the debate about declaring English the official language of the United States.

This study collected data from over 5,000 children and is the largest study of its kind in recent history. There are those who want to establish English as the official language who believe and frequently try to get others to believe that English is somehow in jeopardy of becoming extinct because immigrants are not willing to learn English.

In direct contrast to these assumptions, in San Diego, according to the Portes-Rumbaut findings, 90 percent of the respondents reported speaking English well or very well, and in Miami, this figure was over 99 percent. In fact, also sometimes advocates of declaring English the official language have proclaimed that immigrants have too strong a desire to retain their native language, a desire which I do not find problematic, but perhaps some people do.

However, this study found that, surprisingly, between 65 to 81 percent of the children of immigrants preferred speaking English to their parents' native language. So what we have, basically, is a replication of the exact same linguistic assimilation process that existed in this country at the turn of the century, and it has been largely undocumented and not well understood because people do not want to find out what exactly is going on in these communities.

In fact, the exact opposite problem has been expressed by many immigrant communities where, in fact, language loss is occurring at a very rapid rate, something that should be of concern to a country interested in educating its children, and certainly a country that should learn how to value bilingualism for its own sake.

This study also pointed out that quite contrary to the common assumption, if students live in kind of ethnic enclaves or neighborhoods where they have larger numbers of people from similar ethnic backgrounds, they actually are likely to learn English faster than people who live in more isolated

communities related to their ethnic background. So this study challenges a lot of commonsense assumptions about the nature of linguistic assimilation this country.

This really should be the basis of our understanding of why we may not need to declare English the official language of the United States. It already functions as the lingua franca of the country. There are no problems associated with that. Any attempt to introduce English as the official language is an attempt to solve a problem which simply does not exist.

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF THE PARTIAL BIRTH ABORTION BAN LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I probably will not take my 5 minutes. I do want to take a few minutes tonight and talk a little about a newspaper that came to our house that we get every month from the diocese of Winona.

Hubert Humphrey, who came from Minnesota, a great Senator from the other party, once observed that if you love your God, you must love his children. I want to talk for a few minutes about the issue that was at the center of this month's issue of the Courier newspaper that is published by the diocese of Winona; that is, the partial birth abortion ban veto of the President by a few weeks ago.

In some of the strongest language I think I have ever seen on the pages of this newspaper, they take the President and the veto and the entire issue of the partial birth abortion ban to task. I would like to read for the RECORD, and I will place this into the RECORD, a letter that was written by all of the Minnesota bishops to express their position on this issue, because, as I say, this is some of the strongest language I think I have ever heard them use, and I think it needs to be part of this debate.

I think Americans of all faiths, Americans of all particular stripes, and frankly, an awful lot of Americans who would describe themselves as pro-choice, find themselves somewhat surprised by the veto, and are saying that it is time that the Congress try to muster the votes so we can override this veto.

I want to read the letter that the Catholic bishops put together, because it is such a strongly worded letter and such a good letter.

Let me read it:

President Clinton's veto of the Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act is no less offensive for being widely expected. We denounce it. We do so not only from the resources of our faith, but also as citizens who, like millions of others, fear that this veto further imperils the human rights principles that have guided our nation for over 200 years.

The President claims that the Constitution forces him to veto the partial birth ban because *Roe v. Wade* requires an exception for serious adverse health consequences. But as the President and everyone familiar with abortion law knows, neither the *Roe* Court nor any other has ever ruled on the constitutionality of a law against killing a child during the process of being born. It is also well known that a "health" abortion, as interpreted by the Supreme Court, includes reasons having to do with a woman's marital status and age, as well as for any reason relevant to a pregnant woman's social or emotional "well being." In other words, the exception the President insists upon would only ensure the continued practices of partial-birth abortions for virtually any reason whatsoever.

No claims about "what the Constitution requires" and no rhetoric about "safe, legal and rare" abortions can camouflage the nature of this Presidential veto. It is a declaration of unconditional support for abortion—abortions under any circumstances and by any means whatsoever, even those bordering on infanticide.

We strongly urge Congress to override this indefensible presidential veto and to begin to bring a modicum of sanity to the abortion debate in our country.

□ 1930

As I said, Mr. Speaker, this is one of the strongest letters I think the Minnesota Bishops have ever put together, but this is an important issue. I hope that all Americans will join in this debate, and I hope all Americans will pray for this Congress, pray for this national leadership so that we can bring an end to this grisly, destructive practice which the Congress is attempting to outlaw. If we can get the votes to override this veto, we can bring an end to this procedure once and for all in the United States.

MENTAL ILLNESS PARITY SHOULD BE PART OF HEALTH INSURANCE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUTCHINSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TOWNS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, each year mental health services are being provided to millions of our constituents, representing every age, ethnic and economic group in the country. Unlike many insurance policies, mental health illness does not discriminate among its victims. The illness could hit any one. And, without the proper treatment, leave an entire family scarred for life.

Mental illness can be every bit as debilitating as other major medical illnesses including heart disease and cancer; like them, mental illness can be successfully treated, enabling patients to return to productive lives. It would be unconscionable to legislate limits on the scope and duration of treatment for cancer, heart disease or diabetes. Unfortunately, time after time, limits are placed on mental health services and it is wrong.

For some strange reason there is a stigma placed on mental illness and I