

(2) PROJECT-BASED ASSISTANCE.—Is as defined in section 16(c) of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937, except that such term includes assistance under any successor programs to the programs referred to in that section.

(3) SECRETARY.—Means the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

(4) STATE.—Means the States of the U.S., DC, Puerto Rico, the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and any other territory or possession of the U.S.

SECTION 10. Gives the Secretary authority to issue any necessary regulations.

SECTION 11. Authorizes such sums as necessary from 2000 through 2004 for grants under this Act.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE AMENDMENT

HON. JOHN T. DOOLITTLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1999

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the English Language Amendment to the Constitution. It is my belief that this legislation is critically needed at this day and hour. It is time for Congress to stand up and reaffirm that this nation of immigrants requires the unity of a national language.

Mr. Speaker, for over 200 years, America has made a home for immigrants from all over the globe. The newest American citizen is considered just as good an American as the citizen whose ancestors can be traced to the Mayflower. The United States has managed to accomplish what few nations have even dared to attempt: we are one nation even though each of us may have ancestors who fought against each other in generations past.

This has been made possible by our common flag and our common language. The immigrant struggling to learn English in order to become a citizen is an ancestor of many of the Members of this House. The child of immigrants, going to school, learning English and playing baseball is the ancestor of many of us as well. And others here are that child a few years later, having the honor of representing many other Americans as a U.S. Congressman.

Learning English was not always easy. And America has not always lived up to its high ideal that we are E Pluribus Unum—"out of many, one." But for most of our Nation's history, the English language was both the language of opportunity and the language of unity.

During the 1960's, the notion of our common language came under attack. There were those who felt America had nothing worthy of pride. Some of these people gave the impression that they did not think the United States of America itself was a good idea.

While those days are over, many of the ideas of that period are part of federal law. One of the most divisive of those notions was government multilingualism and multiculturalism. These ideas have infiltrated government at all levels. Yet these ideas were opposed and then and remain opposed to now by a vast majority of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we would all concede that notions like bilingual ballots and bilingual

education were well meant when they were proposed. But also believe that it is time that we ended this failed experiment in official multilingualism.

I believe this experiment should be ended because government multilingualism is divisive. It seems that no amount of translation services is ever sufficient. Michigan offers its driver test in 20 languages. There are 100 languages spoken in the Chicago school system. Yet hard-pressed taxpayers know that they are one lawsuit away from yet another mandatory translation requirement.

There are those who say that this amendment is not necessary. I would remind them that right across the street the Supreme Court will decide whether any official English legislation is Constitutional. Even though we may desire less comprehensive approaches to this issue, the actions of this Court, or a future Court, may well undercut any official English legislation short of the English Language Amendment (ELA).

In 1996, I spoke with pride on behalf of the official English bill originally introduced by my colleague from the great State of California, DUKE CUNNINGHAM. That was a good bill and would have made a good beginning.

However, given that groups like the American Civil Liberties Union with their legions of lawyers stand ready to haul any official English legislation into court, I believe that we must accept the fact that Congress will be continually forced to revisit this issue until we successfully add the ELA to our Constitution.

The path of a Constitutional amendment is not easy. The Founding Fathers made certain that only the most important issues could succeed in achieving Constitutional protection.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that preserving our national unity through making English this Nation's official language is just such a critical issue. Look around the world. Neighbor fights with neighbor even when they speak a common language. Linguistic divisions swiftly lead to other divisions.

Mr. Speaker, if the ELA is adopted, states like my own will save money. Under our current laws, the minute an immigrant sets foot on U.S. soil, he and his family are entitled to a multitude of government services, each provided in that immigrant's native tongue. When their children start school, we cannot give them English classes—instead California and other States must provide schooling to these children in the language of their parents. Bilingual education alone is an unfunded \$8 billion mandate on State and local taxpayers.

There is a sense in this body when the time has come for certain legislation. I submit that the time has indeed come for the English Language Amendment and I urge its adoption.

INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 168, THE GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT ACT

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1999

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) is a true

national treasure. It provides open space and recreation in the midst of a densely populated urban area, and it is one of our Nation's most heavily used national parks. I urge my colleagues to support my legislation, H.R. 168, which would expand the boundaries of the GGNRA to include an additional 1,300 critical acres of land adjacent to existing GGNRA parkland.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation has the bipartisan support of the entire Bay Area Congressional Delegation. Joining me as cosponsors of this legislation are our colleagues NANCY PELOSI, ANNA ESHOO, TOM CAMPBELL, GEORGE MILLER, LYNN WOOLSEY, PETE STARK, ELLEN TAUSCHER, BARBARA LEE, and ZOE LOFGREN.

H.R. 168, the Golden Gate National Recreation Area Boundary Adjustment Act, will permit the National Park Service to acquire carefully selected critical natural areas in San Mateo County, primarily in the area around the City of Pacifica. National Park Service officials in the Bay Area conducted a boundary study to evaluate the desirability of including additional lands in and around Pacifica within the GGNRA. During the preparation of the Park Service study, a public forum was held to gather comments from area residents, and local input was reflected in the final study. The Pacifica City Council adopted a resolution endorsing the addition of these areas to the GGNRA. The GGNRA and the Point Reyes National Seashore Advisory Commission also urged the addition of these new areas to the park.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation has the strong support of local environmental advocacy and preservation groups. The Loma Prieta Chapter of the Sierra Club contacted me to express support for this important legislation. In a letter endorsing this bill, the Sierra Club wrote that "by expanding the boundaries of the GGNRA, the legislation would allow acquisition of parcels which are natural extensions of the park." The letter continued that this legislation "would protect both views and habitats as well as provide additional recreational opportunities for local residents as well as visitors to the Bay Area. The open spaces and the vistas from these sites are national treasures and it is appropriate to include them in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. By including them in GGNRA, visitors to the Bay Area will be given a chance to experience their wonder."

H.R. 168 would expand the boundary of GGNRA to permit the inclusion of lands directly adjacent to existing parkland as well as nearby lands along the Pacific Ocean. The upper parcels of land offer beautiful vistas, sweeping coastal views, and spectacular headland scenery. Inclusion of these lands would also protect the important habitats of several species of rare or endangered plants and animals. The legislation offers improved access to existing trails and beach paths and would protect important ecosystems from encroaching development.

The GGNRA Boundary Adjustment Act would also permit the inclusion of beautiful headlands along the coast into GGNRA. The coastal headlands of San Pedro Point, the Rockaway Headland, Northern Coastal Bluffs, and the Bowl & Fish would be included in the GGNRA under this legislation. These parcels would offer park visitors scenic panoramas up

and down the coast, views of tide pools and offshore rocks, sweeping views of GGNRA ridges to the east, as well as additional access to the Pacific Ocean.

Mr. Speaker, throughout my service in Congress, I have had a strong interest in preserving the unique natural areas of the Peninsula. In the early 1980's, I fought for the inclusion in GGNRA of Sweeney Ridge, which includes the site from which Spanish explorers first sighted the San Francisco Bay in the 18th century. The ridge affords a unique panorama of the entire Bay. In 1984, in the face of a long and hard battle waged by myself and former Congressmen Leo Ryan and Phil Burton, the Reagan Administration acquiesced, and Sweeney Ridge became a part of our protected natural heritage.

In the early 1990's, I authored and secured passage of legislation to add the Phleger Estate to the GGNRA. The Phleger Estate includes over a thousand acres of pristine second-growth redwoods and evergreen forests adjacent to the Crystal Springs watershed in the mid-Peninsula. The Federal Government paid one-half of the cost of acquiring the Phleger Estate. The other half of the cost was paid for through private contributions raised by the Peninsula Open Space Trust (POST). Our distinguished colleague, Congresswoman ANNA ESHOO, played a key role in winning congressional approval of the Federal Government's share of the purchase. The Phleger Estate is now part of the GGNRA and it has become an important hiking and recreation area on the Peninsula.

Mr. Speaker, preserving our country's unique natural areas must be one of our highest national priorities, and it is one of my highest priorities as a Member of Congress. We must preserve and protect these areas for our children and our grandchildren today or they will be lost forever. Adding these new lands in and around Pacifica to the GGNRA will allow us to protect these fragile areas from development or other inappropriate uses which would destroy the scenic beauty and natural character of this key part of the Bay Area. I urge my colleagues to support passage of H.R. 168, the Golden Gate National Recreation Area Boundary Adjustment Act.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4,

1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, January 21, 1999 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JANUARY 22

9:30 a.m.
Budget
To resume hearings on certain Social Security issues in the 21st Century. SD-608

10 a.m.
Finance
To hold an organizational meeting; and to consider the proposed Miscellaneous Trade and Technical Corrections Act of 1999 and pending nominations. SD-215

JANUARY 25

10 a.m.
Budget
To hold hearings on national defense budget issues. SD-608

JANUARY 26

Time to be announced
Finance
To hold hearings on U.S. trade policy issues, focusing on international economic and export promotion programs. SD-215

9:30 a.m.
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
To hold hearings to examine opportunities to improve education. SD-430

JANUARY 27

Time to be announced
Finance
To continue hearings on U.S. trade policy issues, focusing on agricultural, service and manufacturing programs and the U.S. steel industry during the global financial crisis. SD-215

8:30 a.m.
Judiciary
Antitrust, Business Rights, and Competition Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the Echostar/MCI satellite-cable competition deal. SD-226

9:30 a.m.
Budget
Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 92, to provide for biennial budget process and a biennial appropriations process and to enhance oversight and the performance of the Federal Government; and S. 93, to improve and strengthen the budget process. SD-106

Energy and Natural Resources
To hold oversight hearings on the impacts of outer continental shelf activity on coastal states and communities. SH-216

JANUARY 28

Time to be announced
Finance
To continue hearings on U.S. trade policy issues, focusing on labor and environmental standards. SD-215

9 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold oversight hearings on the state of the petroleum industry. SH-216

FEBRUARY 10

8:30 a.m.
Judiciary
Antitrust, Business Rights, and Competition Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review competition and antitrust issues relating to the Telecom Act. SD-226