

otherwise eligible for assistance with grant amounts under (b) or (c) and also meets the requirements of the (1) in either of the other subsections—that is, it is a 221(d)(3), 221(d)(5), or a 236 building, or, is subject to a contract for project-based assistance—will be eligible for such assistance only if it complies with all the requirements under the other subsection.

SECTION 5. GRANT AMOUNT LIMITATION.—The Secretary can limit grants to States based upon the proportion of such State's need compared to the aggregate need among all States approved for such assistance for such a fiscal year.

SECTION 6. MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of HUD cannot make a grant that exceeds twice the amount the State certifies that the State will contribute for a fiscal year, or has contributed since January 1, 1999, from non-Federal sources for preservation of affordable housing as described in Section 4(a).

(b) TREATMENT OF PREVIOUS CONTRIBUTIONS.—Any portion of amounts contributed after 1.1.99, that are counted for a fiscal year, may not be counted for any subsequent fiscal year.

(c) TREATMENT OF TAX CREDITS.—Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC) and proceeds from the sale of tax-exempt bonds shall not be considered non-federal sources for purposes of this section.

SECTION 7. TREATMENT OF SUBSIDY LAYERING REQUIREMENTS.—Neither section 6 nor any other provision of this Act should prevent using the Low Income Housing Tax Credit in connection with housing assisted under this Act, subject to following Section 102(d) of the HUD Reform of 1989 and section 911 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992.

SECTION 8. APPLICATIONS.—The Secretary shall provide for States to submit applications for grants under this Act with such information and certifications that are necessary.

SECTION 9. DEFINITIONS.—For this Act, the following definitions apply:

(1) LOW-INCOME AFFORDABILITY RESTRICTIONS.—With respect to a housing project, any limitations imposed by regulation or agreement on rents for tenants of the project, rent contributions for tennis of the project, or income-eligibility for occupancy in the project.

(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.

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

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