

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