

the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) that there is nothing in here, that this is an English-only bill. I don't know where that came from. The gentleman from California mentioned it as part of some kind of anti-immigrant plot. Not so. There is none of that in here.

What is in here is a good-faith effort to try and improve the fluency of people who do not speak English and allow them to transition into an English-speaking society, which we are in the United States of America; and I think it is a genuine and good effort.

We may disagree whether we have got the right way or the wrong way, but we have certainly provided ample time for debate to deal with that.

I note that several of our colleagues from the other side of the aisle are a little scared of the 3 years that this program enrollment period goes for, and it is 3 years, not 2. They are worried about meeting some kind of a standard or a merit or having any kind of a measure of performance applied.

I can tell my colleagues that I have youngsters in my district who have been in these programs for 4 or 5 years, and they are not learning English. They are stuck in their own community, not taking advantage of becoming English speakers, even though their parents wish them to be fluent and proficient in English because they understand how important that is for the future. Yet, these programs are not working.

I think it is fair to say that we do not have a complete success story or anything like it in the status quo. We are trying to find a way to move forward from the status quo.

I notice my colleagues on the other side have suggested that the status quo is better than what we are presenting, in their view; and in some cases, they have offered some gutting amendments or will offer some gutting amendments, I am told. But I have not heard about any great new programs or any great new ideas.

We have now carved out 3 hours of amendment time. This is a good time to bring forth some brave new ideas, if you have not been able to do it yet. I challenge my colleagues to do that.

I would suggest that my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), the chairman, and the gentleman from California (Mr. RIGGS), who is the author of much of this, have done a pretty good job of bringing forth some new ideas. I think it is extremely important that we debate these ideas in a fair way, and that is why we have so much time scheduled for the amendments and any thoughts that anybody has.

In fact, as we have seen, we have used a good part of our rule discussion dealing with trying to understand what the issue is here right now. We have heard all kinds of statements made several times, and it seems like it is getting to be a mantra that somehow or another we are taking away local control. On

the contrary, this bill provides for more local control.

Everybody knows that that is one of the planks of the GOP policy is to go to local control for our education people back in the community. This is very consistent with that; otherwise, I do not think this legislation would have gotten this far.

So I think to try and mischaracterize this as any way taking away local control is not straightforward. The idea that perhaps we are trampling on some children's rights by trying to help them learn language and become proficient in the language of our country, which is primarily English, seems to me to be a little bizarre. I think trying to help out our youngsters is a very important thing.

I do note that one of the speakers on the other side mentioned that children are not a political issue. I quite agree that children should not become a partisan political issue. But I do believe children are very much part of our process, and I believe it is very important to legislate and look out for your youngsters.

That is why most of the people who have reached my age in life get out of bed in the morning and go to work, to make sure that what our kids have is a little better than what we started with if there is a way to do that.

So I think that we are trying to do something honorable and something useful and something beneficial for our Nation's children. I think we are trying to do it in a very, very reasonable way. I say that because I hate to see these debates hijacked and scare tactics.

I remember very well some years ago I went home to town meetings and was informed by people there that we were not going to have any longer a school lunch program, and mean-spirited people were going to take away children's school lunch program. That was bologna. That was hogwash. It was not true. It never was true. But it was a great story. It was partisan politics at election time.

This bill deserves better than that. This is a good bill, and it should be discussed for what it says, not what some people keep characterizing that it might say.

So I would urge my colleagues very much to pay attention to this debate, that we go forward now with this rule, that we get into this debate. I hope people will agree that this is a very honorable effort to improve the process of bringing those who do not speak English into the society that does speak English and in this place we call the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 3694, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3694) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1999 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement Disability System, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida? The Chair hears none, and without objection, appoints the following conferees:

From the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. GOSS, YOUNG of Florida, LEWIS of California, SHUSTER, MCCOLLUM, CASTLE, BOEHLERT, BASS, GIBBONS, DICKS, DIXON, SKAGGS, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. SKELTON and Mr. BISHOP.

From the Committee on National Security, for consideration of the House bill and Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STUMP and Ms. SANCHEZ.

There was no objection.

□ 1430

#### ENGLISH LANGUAGE FLUENCY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU). Pursuant to House Resolution 516 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3892.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3829) to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to establish a program to help children and youth learn English, and for other purposes, with Mr. LAHOOD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make a couple of preliminary statements that I