

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. 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?