

they amend these proposals, we should not be imposing them upon the country.

I move the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA).

(Mr. HINOJOSA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Istook amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues to oppose Mr. ISTOOK's amendment to impede the implementation of the Executive order to "Improve Access to Services for Persons with Limited English Proficiency."

The Executive order is about fairness. Individuals with limited English proficiency should not be blocked from accessing vital services paid for by their, and their families', tax dollars.

The Executive order simply gives guidance on how the Federal Government and Federal Government contractors can comply with existing civil rights law that bars discrimination based on national origin.

Until this Executive order was issued, existing civil rights law to protect limited English proficient persons went largely ignored.

The Executive order is reasonable, flexible, and accommodating to small contractors and government agencies. It recognizes that only critical services, directly affecting health and livelihoods, are required to be translated. Implementing the Executive order makes sense.

Imagine what would happen if someone with weak English skills who has a communicable disease, like small pox or tuberculosis, is unable to understand the advice of health professionals. A public health hazard could ensue, harming many more people.

Mr. Chairman, I hope my colleagues will join me in opposing the Istook amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute and 10 seconds to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU).

(Mr. WU asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WU. Mr. Chairman, we are all products of our own past, I suppose. I came to this country not understanding a word of English and I am still working on my limited English proficiency. But when I was in the fourth grade, my dentist, Dr. Sadao, my doctor, Dr. Linnertz, would say to me, "David, let me tell you something and then you translate it for your mother. And then your mother can tell you and then you can tell me."

To me, my mother spoke perfectly fine English and so did Dr. Linnertz and so did Dr. Sadao. What we are really talking about are all those people out there who do not have a little fourth-grade David to translate for them. I want to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma who he proposes to leave behind: My mother? Another little old lady from somewhere else in the world?

I would like to read something into the RECORD: "I believe that every right implies a responsibility, every opportunity an obligation, every possession

a duty." Those are the words of John D. Rockefeller. I tell children all the time, you have got to learn the king's English. But if you are asking children to learn the king's English, for God sakes you cannot leave their parents behind. You cannot leave their grandparents behind.

I would like the folks on the other side of this argument to say, who are you leaving behind? Who will you cut out of the ability to participate in our self-governing democratic society?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

There is an executive order which the gentleman from Oklahoma does not like. A Republican President, a Republican White House, is now reviewing that executive order. Let us have the Congress get out of the way and give him time to do it before we jump to conclusions.

As the gentleman has indicated, when you are in a doctor's office and you need help, you do not have time for an English lesson.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Istook amendment.

This abstinence-only amendment is a narrow and unrealistic approach to addressing adolescent sexuality. We're not saying that our young people should not be encouraged to abstain from sexual activity. We're just saying they also need to be informed about how to protect themselves from unintended pregnancy, HIV/AIDS, and other STDs.

The truth is, comprehensive sexuality education programs expose young adults to important information that they will not learn from an abstinence-only program.

To date, there is no real evidence that can defend the effectiveness of abstinence-only programs. Without such evidence, we cannot justify spending additional dollars on a program that's already well funded.

However, family planning and comprehensive sexuality education programs have clearly shown their effectiveness and ability to help curb teen pregnancy.

Let's protect our Nation's future by providing teens with the educational tools they need to be responsible.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the Istook amendment.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the Istook amendment calling for a \$33 million increase in abstinence-only education.

First, everyone should understand one thing—this program is already receiving a 100 percent increase in its funding over last year. That is without the Istook amendment.

To put that in perspective—the President's number one priority during his campaign (besides tax cuts) was education—and that receives a 17 percent increase.

So, make no mistake about it, the Congress is already spending large sums on the abstinence-only program, and we won't know the effectiveness and results of the program until the congressionally mandated report comes due in 2005.

What we do know is that publicly funded family planning has a significant effect on teen pregnancy. Each year, family planning services prevent an estimated 386,000 teenagers from becoming pregnant.

Title X funding plays a critical role in the lives of teens across America—in preventing

unwanted pregnancy and in providing needed services to young people. Through title X teens receive gynecological exams, screening for breast and cervical cancer, STD treatment, HIV testing, contraceptive care, and counseling.

These services are desperately needed since we know that more than 750,000 teenagers become pregnant each year, and 80 percent of those pregnancies are unintended. We know that nearly 4 million teenagers acquire a sexually transmitted disease by age 24; and that an average of two young people are infected with HIV every hour of every day.

It takes a comprehensive approach to address these problems and that is why more than 120 national organizations support comprehensive sex education including: American Academy of Pediatrics, American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, American Medical Association, American Public Health Association, National Education Association, National Medical Association, National School Boards Association, and Society for Adolescent Medicine.

Americans overwhelmingly support sex education—more than 8 in 10 Americans favor comprehensive sex education that includes information about contraception.

I urge my colleagues to heed their call and to continue to push for comprehensive education. This is not the time to increase funding even more than we already have for an untested program that is so limited in scope.

I urge my colleagues to reject the Istook amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. COMBEST, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3061) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

□ 1915

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within

which to revise and extend their remarks on H.J. Res. 68; and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2002

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 68) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2002, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) to explain the resolution before us.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me just to explain briefly.

Mr. Speaker, this is a continuing resolution. The CR that we passed last week runs the government until the 16th of October. It is obvious we are not going to complete all of our conference reports by then. This would extend the present CR for an additional week, until the 23rd of October, by which time we will hope to have most, if not all, of the conferences on appropriations bills completed.

In addition, this CR does make a technical change to a provision in the previous CR relative to the Export-Import Bank. Also it allows the Defense Health Program to make payments under the TRICARE for Life program at rates that have already been authorized by the fiscal year 2001 National Defense Authorization Act.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, this provides authority to the agencies to begin the preparation of the benefit checks that will be mailed on the first of November in order to begin processing those payments. It is important that we include that in this CR.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, under my reservation, I would simply say I agree with the gentleman on the need to pass this.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES 68

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 107-44 is amended by striking "October 16, 2001" in section 107(c) and inserting in lieu thereof

"October 23, 2001"; by adding the following before the semicolon in section 101(b)(1) "": *Provided, That the rate for operations of the Defense Health Program may exceed the current rate as may be necessary to fund a pro rata share of the program expansion authorized by section 712(a) of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106-398)"; by striking section 115 and adding the following: "Sec. 115. Notwithstanding the dates specified in section 7 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635f) and section 1(c) of Public Law 103-428, the Export-Import Bank of the United States shall continue to exercise its functions in connection with and in furtherance of its objects and purposes through the date specified in section 107(c) of this joint resolution."; and adding the following new section: "Sec. 123. Notwithstanding section 107, funds shall be available and obligations for mandatory payments due on or about November 1, 2001, may continue to be made.".*

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3061.

□ 1918

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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3061) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, with Mr. GUTKNECHT (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) had been postponed and the bill was open for amendment from page 82, line 17, through page 102, line 2.

Are there further amendments to this portion of the bill?

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

Amendment by Mr. STEARNS of Florida; the first amendment by Mr. ISTOOK of Oklahoma; the second amendment by Mr. ISTOOK of Oklahoma.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) on which further proceedings were postponed, and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 107, noes 312, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 378]

AYES—107

Aderholt	Forbes	Petri
Akin	Gallegly	Pickering
Armey	Goode	Pitts
Bachus	Goodlatte	Pombo
Baker	Goss	Putnam
Barr	Graves	Ramstad
Bartlett	Green (WI)	Riley
Barton	Gutknecht	Rohrabacher
Brady (TX)	Hart	Royce
Bryant	Hayes	Ryan (WI)
Burr	Hayworth	Ryun (KS)
Burton	Hefley	Schaffer
Camp	Herger	Sensenbrenner
Cannon	Hilleary	Sessions
Cantor	Hoekstra	Shadegg
Chabot	Hostettler	Shows
Chambliss	Hulshof	Smith (MI)
Coble	Hunter	Smith (NJ)
Collins	Isakson	Stearns
Combest	Johnson, Sam	Stump
Cooksey	Jones (NC)	Tancredo
Cox	Keller	Tauzin
Crane	Kennedy (MN)	Taylor (NC)
Cubin	Kerns	Terry
Culberson	Largent	Thornberry
Davis, Jo Ann	Lewis (KY)	Tiahrt
Deal	Linder	Toomey
DeLay	LoBiondo	Turner
DeMint	Manzullo	Upton
Diaz-Balart	McCrery	Vitter
Doolittle	Miller, Gary	Watkins (OK)
Duncan	Norwood	Watts (OK)
Emerson	Otter	Weldon (FL)
Ferguson	Oxley	Weller
Flake	Paul	Wicker
Foley	Pence	

NOES—312

Abercrombie	Boswell	Cunningham
Ackerman	Boucher	Davis (CA)
Allen	Boyd	Davis (FL)
Andrews	Brady (PA)	Davis (IL)
Baca	Brown (FL)	Davis, Tom
Baird	Brown (OH)	DeFazio
Baldacci	Brown (SC)	DeGette
Baldwin	Buyer	Delahunt
Ballenger	Callahan	DeLauro
Barcia	Calvert	Deutsch
Barrett	Capito	Dicks
Bass	Capps	Dingell
Becerra	Capuano	Doggett
Bentsen	Cardin	Dooley
Bereuter	Carson (IN)	Doyle
Berkley	Carson (OK)	Dreier
Berman	Castle	Dunn
Berry	Clay	Edwards
Biggert	Clayton	Ehlers
Bilirakis	Clement	Ehrlich
Bishop	Clyburn	English
Blagojevich	Condit	Eshoo
Blumenauer	Conyers	Etheridge
Boehrlert	Costello	Evans
Boehner	Coyne	Everett
Bonilla	Cramer	Farr
Bonior	Crenshaw	Fattah
Bono	Crowley	Finer
Borski	Cummings	Fletcher