necessary; to have put in place major investment reforms; and, if appropriate, to have agreed with its commercial bank lenders on a satisfactory lending program.

It is this Member's understanding that the IMF is negotiating a potential staff-monitored program with Bangladesh. In addition, as evidence of major investment reforms, Bangladesh has concluded a bilateral investment treaty with the United States.

On a preliminary basis, the Department of the Treasury has determined that if Bangladesh concludes its negotiations on an IMF staff-monitored program, it should meet with economic eligibility requirements for debt reduction under this legislation.

Based on the above, this Member concludes that Bangladesh does indeed meet all three provisions of this legislation. Debt buybacks such as are envisioned in this legislation would permit Bangladesh address its lingering debt problem, while preserving its threatened tropical forests.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, this Member would again like to thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PORTMAN] for introducing this important piece of legislation. This Member would also commend the efforts of the Chairman of the Committee on International Relations, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for the leadership he had demonstrated over the years on environmental matters.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the matter being considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the initial request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHILD CUSTODY PROTECTION ACT

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 499 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3682) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State lines to avoid laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The amendment recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) two hours of debate on the bill, as amended, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Yesterday, the Committee on Rules met and granted a closed rule for H.R. 3682, the Child Custody Protection Act. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 3682 in the House with 2 hours of debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. It also provides the Committee on the Judiciary amendment now printed in the bill will be considered as adopted. Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, the Child Custody Protection Act is important to any parent who has a teenage daughter. As we know, people in several States have recently decided that a parent should know before their child has an abortion. We all hope that our teenage daughters have the wisdom to avoid pregnancy, but if they make a mistake, a parent is best able to provide advice and counseling. Also more than anyone else, a parent knows their child's medical history. For these reasons, my home State of North Carolina requires a parent to know before their child checks into an abortion clinic, as does the State of Pennsylvania.

Last month, though, the Senate Committee on the Judiciary heard chilling testimony about how lawbreaking citizens risk children's lives by taking them from their parents for out-of-State abortions. Before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Joyce Farley, a mother from Pennsylvania, told the tragic story of her 13-year-old daughter.

Three years ago this summer, a stranger took Mrs. Farley's child out of school, provided her with alcohol, transported her out of State to have an abortion, falsified medical records at the abortion clinic and abandoned her in a town 30 miles away, frightened and bleeding. Why? Because this stranger's adult son had raped Joyce Farley's teenage daughter, and she was desperate to cover up her son's tracks. Even worse, this all may have been legal. It is perfectly legal to avoid parental abortion consent and notification laws by driving children to another State. This is wrong, and it has to be stopped.

According to the Reproductive Law and Policy Center, a pro-abortion group in New York, thousands of adults across the country carry children over State lines to get abortions in States without parental notification laws. These clinics advertise in the yellow pages that no parental consent is needed. So-called men in their 20s and 30s coerce teenage girls to have abortions out of State and without their parents' knowledge.

The Child Custody Protection Act will put a stop to this child abuse. If passed, the law would make it a crime to transport a minor across State lines to avoid laws that require parental consent or notification before an abortion.

Right now a parent in Charlotte, North Carolina, must grant permission before the school nurse gives their child an aspirin, but a parent cannot prevent a stranger from taking their child out of school and up to New York City for an abortion. This is plain nonsense. It has to be stopped.

Let us do something to help thousands of children in this country. Let us pass the Child Custody Protection Act and put an end to the absurd notion that there is some sort of constitutional right for an adult stranger to secretly take someone's teenage daughter into a different State for an abortion.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and support the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this closed rule. The majority claims to favor full and free debate on important issues but, however, on this controversial bill the majority has chosen to prohibit any amendments from being offered. Although no amendments will be allowed, the rule allows two hours of debate instead of the usual one. This proposed rule for floor consideration might lead a cynic to believe that the majority does not want to actually perfect legislation on a health and privacy issue. But, no, this process and this rule do not foster deliberation, but are more conducive to a 2-hour campaign sound bite designed to label opponents of this bill as antiparent and antifamily.

I must also voice my strong concerns with the bill made in order by this rule. The so-called Child Custody Protection Act has the potential to increase the number of unsafe, back-alley abortions in this country and to place the lives and health of young women at risk.

This bill would criminalize the act of bringing a minor across State lines to obtain an abortion without parental consent. Make no mistake, I have very serious concerns about unwanted pregnancies and abortions among young women, but my colleagues who support this bill fail to understand that those young women who have healthy family relationships will seek parental involvement and consent. But we know

that far too many young people do not live in either intact or supportive families. Indeed, a family member may have been responsible for the pregnancy.

Congress cannot legislate healthy, open family relationships. This bill will force some young women to seek unsafe abortions placing their health and even their lives at risk.

We would all hope that a pregnant minor would have the support and the proper medical care that she needs. However, if the medical well-being of the minor is our concern, Members should vote against the bill.

Does anyone believe that a minor driven by this bill to seek an abortion alone by herself, because the bill does allow her to go alone, will fare better than a minor who has a relative or friend to go with her to make sure that she is all right?

This bill could result in the death or permanent disability of young women forced to seek abortions without the support of the adults that she may trust because they will be afraid of imprisonment if they help her, even if they talk with her.

Now, some claim that this bill is about States rights to enforce States laws, but if that is the rationale of this bill, this bill is far too narrow. Why not put a prohibition on selling any guns to out-of-State buyers who are evading their own State's guns regulation? My State of New York would be far safer if that prohibition were law.

Perhaps we should consider passing a law to prevent people from shopping in other States where the sales taxes are lower than in their State. Maybe Americans should be prevented from going to casinos if they are from a State where gambling is illegal.

Of course, such laws would be both ridiculous and unconstitutional. Harvard Professor Lawrence Tribe has stated that H.R. 3682 violates the Constitution in the three following ways:

One, it breaches the constitutional principles of federalism; two, it imposes an undue burden upon the constitutional right to choose an abortion; three, it lacks the constitutionally required emergency exception for circumstances where the health of the pregnant minor would require travel across State lines for an abortion.

When a distinguished scholar raises constitutional objections about a bill, it is folly to prohibit Members from amending the bill to meet those objections. But, unfortunately, the supporters of this law have decided once again to flout the Constitution and the principles of health care and confidentiality in their unending quest to make abortion inaccessible, if not illegal.

They do not expect this bill to become law. In fact, they know that it will not. They do expect, however, to score political points with particular special interest groups. President Clinton's advisors have recommended he veto the bill in its current form.

If the bill's proponents are serious about enacting this bill into law, they will join me in voting to defeat the previous question. And if the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the rule to make in order all of the amendments submitted to the Committee on Rules. That would allow the House to perfect the bill so that it might really have a chance of enactment into law.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this closed rule because it circumvents thoughtful consideration of an important public health issue. I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question, defeat the closed rule, and, most importantly, defeat the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that State parental notification laws already have all medical exceptions and judicial bypass procedures to provide for a child's health in them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule to H.R. 3682, the Child Custody Protection Act.

This much-needed legislation will assure that the rights of parents across the Nation are not trampled by strangers who, without the knowledge of the parents, take the minor girls to obtain an abortion. This bill, H.R. 3682, would assure that the State's parental consent or notification laws are not evaded by these unscrupulous persons who seek to play and pretend to be mother and father to our children.

Right now 16 States have parental consent laws on abortion, and 10 others have parental notification laws. Yet these are for naught because the abortion clinics are able to bypass these laws. This common-sense legislation that is before us today is what is needed to make sure that our State laws are respected.

This bill will assure that what will not happen is what happened to Joyce Farley who was with us this morning. She described a terrible situation in her family where her daughter, without Mrs. Farley even knowing about it, was transferred to another State in order to have an abortion. And then what happened was, because abortion is a serious medical procedure that could have life-threatening ramifications, Mrs. Farley had her young daughter in a very difficult physical state, and this is not legislation that we should really worry so much about.

Some Members are saying, this is a constitutionally sacred, protected right of abortion. Yet nowhere in these Supreme Court decisions does it say that the abortion mills should have the right to transfer and transport girls across State lines to have an abortion without the girl's parents even knowing about it.

This bill will assure that this does not happen, again, by making it a Federal offense for an adult to transport a minor across State lines from a State which has consent or notification laws to a State without them in order to obtain an abortion.

Across the Nation, Mr. Speaker, our children are required to obtain parental permission slips for field trips, for medication in schools and other things. I know in my community of Miami, Florida, we have one of the largest public school systems, and we have forms that the parents need to fill out if your child is going to be given an aspirin or given any kind of medication in school. We have forms that parents have to fill out if your child is going to be taken with the school on an organized and supervised field trip.

☐ 1215

We have forms that the parents have to fill out if they want to take their child early from the school grounds. Yet for an abortion, no such consent or notification is required and, in fact, a child can be transported across State lines for this sensitive and serious operation.

These requirements in the schools are in place to ensure that parents are aware of their minor children's activities and to ensure their safety. Is it too much to ask that our children, who require parental consent to take aspirins in schools, that they receive these forms, yet for a possibly life-threatening medical procedure, with serious physical and mental ramifications, no such consent should be given? I do not think so, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to show my colleagues some of the ads that have been placed in publications in Pennsylvania. These are ads in the Pennsylvania telephone directory saying, ''Come to Pennsylvania?'' No. ''Come to Maryland.'' This is an ad in Pennsylvania saying come to Maryland for this abortion procedure because, children, there is no parental consent in our State of Maryland.

Here is another ad, again in Pennsylvania, where it says, ''Come to a clinic in Pennsylvania?'' No. ''Come to a clinic in New Jersey.'' An ad in Pennsylvania for an abortion clinic in New Jersey, and they are trying to lure children from their parents, lure children away at this very sensitive time, where they could be discussing this difficult decision with their parent.

Now, is this a common sense bill? Of course, it is, Mr. Speaker. In fact, there was a poll recently done, and I know the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) alluded to it, showing 85 percent of the people say yes to the Ros-Lehtinen and Abraham Child Custody Protection Act. When they were asked should a person be able to take a minor girl across State lines to obtain an abortion without her parents' knowledge, they say no, of course not. No, strongly agreed, 78 percent; no, somewhat disagree, 7 percent. So 85 percent say, of course, parents should have the right to be informed about this decision. Parents should be there

to help their minor girls. And I urge my colleagues to support the rule for 3682.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time and for her leadership.

Frankly, I think that most Americans would opt to answer a question when asked if some person should be able to take our children across State lines to encourage or to create the opportunity for an abortion, all parents and people who care would be in great opposition to something posed in that manner.

This is a debate among friends. Frankly, there is a great deal of respect for those who support this legislation, and I hope for those who oppose it. But what we need to discuss now is the reality of what this very good sounding legislation will do.

First of all, it will be intrusive, because 33 States do have these laws and the remainder do not. In fact, the law that we are trying to pass does not answer the concern of what is going on in American families. All of us would hope and advocate that every family in America be an Ozzie and Harriet family. Two parents discussing issues with their children, sitting at the dinner table, having the family picnic, and the regular vacation.

But my friends we must open our eyes. Most young women have to entertain in their lives abuse and/or incest. One-third of those who seek abortions, young women, have been the victim of violence in the home. They have been the victim of incest. And that is the reason that this particular legislation, although it sounds pretty, does not answer the question of reality.

And frankly, I am disappointed in the Committee on Rules, because I thought that they would welcome a more open and a more deliberative dialogue and debate. But yet they have offered to have a closed rule so that those of us who have opposition to the limitations of this law could not readily come to the floor and debate it in an open manner. It is a shame to say that a fix is in in the Committee on Rules. And it happens time after time after time when Democrats have reasonably thought out amendments, amendments that make sense, and yet the Committee on Rules sees fit to have a closed rule.

What am I talking about? The grandmother rule. Do my colleagues realize that this legislation will hold a grandmother criminally liable, with a sentence of 1 year in jail, if because of her caring, loving attitude the young woman has come to her and asked her for advice. What about the male partner; does he not have any responsibility? Are our minds so limited that we cannot recall the tragedy of the two New Jersey teenagers? What did they do? Alleged and convicted of killing their baby because they had no one to talk to. But yet they both came from prominent families.

This does not make sense. Or maybe we are not familiar with Alisha.

My mom is a single parent and is in a treatment facility for drugs and alcohol. I got pregnant while my mom was still in treatment. I am not ready to raise a child at this point in my life. The father of my child doesn't want the child. My mother is not financially able. I am also a patient through MHMRA, which is a mental health and retardation system.

Do we not realize that Americans are made up of all shapes and sizes? Yes, this bill has a good purpose to it, but it is misdirected because it penalizes grandmothers, it penalizes a single parent, a mother who comes from a two-parent notification state. If that mother took that child across State lines, she would be criminally prosecuted because the father was not notified.

We need to think back to our own teenagehood. I simply wish the Committee on Rules had been fair with us Democrats who come time and time again, expressing the views of many of those who find these kinds of one-sided pieces of legislation misdirected and unfair. But yet there they were again. I would ask my colleagues to oppose this rule primarily because it is patently unfair. It does not take into consideration incest and violence against teenagers. It does not take into consideration that we, unfortunately, are not a Land of Oz full of Ozzie and Harriet families.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to speak on this important issue. I am strongly opposing the closed rule imposed upon us by the Rules Committee. This bill will impose restrictions upon our young women which will have devastating consequences.

I hope that my colleagues will consider the importance of this legislation. During markup, and in front of Rules Committee, I offered amendments which would have allowed grandparents, aunts and uncles, and clergy or religious leaders to transport a young woman in crisis across State lines to obtain a safe abortion.

Unfortunately, due to the closed rule we face today, family members, including a minor's grandparents can be criminally prosecuted for assisting their granddaughter in obtaining an abortion. A pregnant minor needs someone to speak with, and someone to trust. If we force our daughters, our granddaughters, our sisters, and our nieces and cousins to act without the guidance of someone they can trust, where will they turn? Perhaps this bill should be called the teen endangerment act!

In fact, yesterday, the House passed legislation which recognized the importance of grandparents in the lives of their grandchildren. Republicans and Democrats alike spoke about how grandparents could offer guidance and love and encouragement to their grandchildren. Yet, the legislation before us today would criminalize grandparents' involvement in their granddaughters' lives.

I am very concerned about children and teenagers in America and I want teenage women to have the right to reproductive health care.

Currently parental involvement laws are in effect in 30 States. Although my home State of Texas does not require parental consent or notification, Louisiana, which borders my home State requires parental consent before a minor can receive an abortion. If H.R. 3682 is passed, the bill would have the effect of federally criminalizing these laws, extending their effect to States that have chosen not to enact such an obstructive and potentially dangerous statute.

I received a letter from a constituent in Houston, Texas, a fifteen year old girl whose mother, a single parent was in a treatment facility for drugs and alcohol. This young woman found herself pregnant while her mother was still in treatment, and without any offer of help from her boyfriend, she made the decision to have an abortion. As a child herself, she did not feel ready to care for a child.

The true victims of this act will be young girls and young women. The enactment of this law would undoubtedly isolate these young women at a time of crisis. If a minor feels she is unable to tell her parents about her pregnancy, she would have no recourse to receive the medical treatment she needs at a time early enough in the pregnancy to perform a safe abortion.

I agree that adolescents should be encouraged to speak with their parents about issues such as family planning and abortion. However, the Government cannot mandate healthy family relations where they do not already exist. We need to protect our young women from being forced to seek unsafe options to terminate their pregnancies, and we need to encourage them to speak with other family members, including their grandparents and religious leaders to guide them through this time of crisis.

I am hopeful that my colleagues will also oppose this restrictive rule and this bill in order to allow young women to access adult guidance and safe, legal abortions.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to my colleague that, yes, this is a closed rule. I will say that the majority of the rules on this House floor since we have been in the majority have been open.

This is just a clean and simple bill that is designed to help States enforce their parental notification laws. We decided that Congress should not override the wishes of voters in 20 States by allowing amendments that would weaken parental notification laws, and that is the reason for the closed rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, this legislation, and I am proud to be a cosponsor of it today, the Ros-Lehtinen Abraham legislation, is extraordinarily important and I think it is fitting and just that we adopt it today and, hopefully, with a very, very large bipartisan margin.

Poll after poll after poll shows that the overwhelming majority of the American people support the right of the parents to be notified if their children are going to have abortions. And as the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) has stated, 20 States have adopted laws to require parents to be notified.

But an industry has developed, in effect, to void, to evade, to dodge those laws passed by the sovereign will of the people of 20 States who have said we want there to be parental notification. So what we are saying is, no, no, they should not be able to, by subterfuge, by plan, evade and dodge those laws. We are saying no, no, they cannot create an industry that, in effect, even in writing, in publications such as the phone books, the yellow pages, an industry that says evade the law, dodge the law in one State, come across the border, and the law will not apply. That is something that is very serious.

Obviously, the underlying topic that is dealt with here is very serious as well. If there is a child with a problem, the parent should know about that child's problem, to work with that child in finding the most just, the most humane solution precisely for that child. That is why 20 States have taken the step of requiring that the parents of the child be notified.

So what we are saying is, no, they cannot avoid, they cannot evade, they cannot dodge the laws by creating what has happened, which is this industry that has risen precisely to make the laws, the State laws, worthless. And that is why this legislation is so very important and so timely, and I commend the leadership for bringing it forward, for supporting the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and, of course, my colleagues on the Committee on Rules for having brought it forth as expeditiously as it has been brought forth.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time and for her leadership on this issue and many others. I rise in opposition to this rule and to this bill, as I have risen in opposition to every other piece of legislation that has moved through this Congress which attacks abortion rights.

This Congress is working to dismantle a woman's most hard fought rights, the right of a safe, legal abortion. Procedure by procedure, obstruction after obstruction this antiwoman Congress is succeeding. This time the targets are on our Nation's young people.

This bill will criminalize the act of taking a noncustodial minor out of State, which requires parental consent, to have an abortion. All of us would hope that our children would be able to confide in us. I am sure that the parents of Amy Grossberg felt that she could confide in them. However, family loyalty kept her from doing that and the situation turned tragic. Sometimes a teenager simply cannot confide in her own family. And if she has no other alternative, no other adult who will help her, she will inevitably resort to an unsafe, unclean, underground clinic, or worse.

Family values simply cannot be legislated. This Congress has no business making laws which force one family member to confide in another. There may be very good reasons a pregnant teen does not want to deal with a parent. He or she could be abusive. There could be a history of incest. Alcohol or drug use could be a factor, or she simply does not feel comfortable telling a parent.

This legislation is not about protecting young women from undue influence, it is about stripping our young people of essential support. It is not about helping our children, it is about abortion politics, and it puts our kids at risk.

I urge a ''no'' vote against this so-called child custody bill and against this rule which did not allow one single Democratic amendment. I urge a ''no'' vote on this rule.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CANADY).

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

I am struck, as I listen to the debate here today, by the fact that the opponents of this bill really are here expressing opposition to the acts of State legislatures. They are here, in effect, expressing opposition to the decisions of the Supreme Court. Because it is the State legislatures that have passed the parental involvement laws that we are seeking to help them enforce, and it is the Supreme Court of the United States which has upheld, under the Constitution, the validity of these parental involvement laws.

So the arguments that we are hearing time and time again that are being urged on us as reasons for not supporting this bill are really arguments that are aimed at the Supreme Court of the United States and of the State legislatures which have seen fit to adopt constitutional valid parental involvement laws.

Now, I think it is also somewhat ironic that we keep hearing about the health of young girls. And I would ask that the Members read something that appeared on the op-ed page of The New York Times on Sunday, July the 12th. The heading for the column: ''Is Parental Guidance Needed?'' It is very interesting because it is by Bruce Luccio, a prominent abortion doctor, and a prominent advocate of abortion rights.

☐ 1230

Now, I do not agree with Dr. Luccio's position on abortion, and I would be quick to point that out, but I do agree with his conclusion about this bill, because Dr. Luccio recognizes, and I quote, that the passage of this bill is important to the health of teenage girls.

Dr. Luccio recognizes that it is the parents who are in the best position to help ensure that the health concerns that are relevant when an abortion is being contemplated are fully considered, and if there are complications in an abortion, it is the parents who are in the best position to ensure that effective and speedy treatment is provided.

I would ask that every Member of this House, regardless of their position on the overall issue of abortion, read this article in the New York Times by Dr. Luccio; and I think it will be very enlightening to them on the issue of the health of the young girls who are involved in this.

Now, I am also struck by the constitutional argument that has been made here. If we listen, in essence, what the opponents of this bill are arguing is that minors have a constitutional right that ensures their right of interstate travel to evade parental supervision.

Well, that is absurd. There is no such right of minors to interstate travel to evade parental supervision. The Supreme Court has never found that there is any such right. And, on the contrary, the Supreme Court has found that parental involvement laws, whether they be consent laws or notification laws, that they meet certain standards that have been articulated by the Supreme Court are valid and constitutional; and those are the kinds of laws that we are seeking to enforce through the bill that we have here today.

All we are saying is that someone should not be able to move a minor across State lines in an effort to evade and thwart the legitimate purposes of those valid constitutional State laws.

Now, let me say this: The Supreme Court has recognized the right of parents. The Supreme Court in this context has not recognized the right of cousins, siblings, grandparents, aunts, uncles, pastors, teachers, or anybody else to be involved in a minor's decision to have an abortion. It is the parents who have that right to be involved.

The courts have recognized that, and the legislatures have recognized it. And I think it is an entirely appropriate use of our power in the Congress to help the States carry out their policy in this area.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, first I think we ought to remind ourselves what this bill does. It does not require parental notification or consent when a minor goes across State lines. What it does is prohibit someone from accompanying them.

In this bill, the child can still evade the parental consent laws of the State and go across State lines alone, but this bill would criminalize anybody accompanying them.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak against the closed rule. It prohibits the ability, our ability, to consider some very important amendments. The administration, in a statement of administration policy, has indicated that the senior advisors of the President will recommend a veto unless these amendments are in the bill.

In recent letters from the White House Chief of Staff to the House and Senate Committees on the Judiciary, the administration in fact said it would support legislation of this nature if it had these few amendments, specifically an amendment to exclude close family members from criminal and civil liability. Under the legislation, grandmothers, aunts, uncles, minor and adult siblings could face criminal prosecution for coming to the aid of a relative; also, to ensure that persons who only provide information, counseling, medical services to the minor would not be subject to liability; and address several constitutional and legal infirmities that the Department of Justice has identified in the legislation. Those concerns were transmitted to the House Committee on the Judiciary on June 24, 1998.

The administration also has serious concerns about the federalism issues. However, as indicated, if the amendments that they have suggested are adopted, they could support the legislation. This closed rule prohibits our ability to consider that legislation. And, therefore, the senior advisors, even if this bill were to pass, will recommend a veto.

We should oppose the closed rule, oppose the motion on the previous question. We should vote no on the previous question so that the rule could be amended to consider these various amendments. If the previous question is ordered, we should just vote no on the rule.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, may I have the division of the time, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) has 16½ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) has 13½ minutes remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I have the deepest personal respect for those whose religion or other personal conviction causes them to take a different view than I have on the question of abortion. But my respect does not go so far as to suggest that I believe they ought to be able to impose their religious views on this issue on someone who does not share those views.

Further, I think personally of my own experience as a father. With my wife of 29 years, we have raised two wonderful daughters. And it is troubling to think that there would be a time in a crisis, including a crisis involving an unwanted pregnancy, when they would not want to come to one of us and discuss this matter.

And yet, I know that this piece of legislation is not about strengthening family ties, because the whole difference of opinion that I have with those who feel so strongly on this abortion question is that the Federal Government and the Members of this House cannot replace broken family ties or the inability of families to communicate.

This piece of legislation does not concern strengthening families, it concerns advancing an agenda of the most fanatical people with reference to this question of invading personal choice.

If we read what they have written, the fanatics on this issue, we will find that they believe that in this country their ultimate goal is to make it a criminal offence, they view it as murder, for anyone at any time after conception to have an abortion. They want to put women who exercise this choice in jail. And they also want to place in jail every health care provider who provides for an abortion at any time after conception.

And recognizing that that fanatic agenda which they have written about cannot be implemented because it is opposed by the vast majority of the American people, they have decided to approach this issue one group at a time and one procedure at a time. So they have done their polls.

And next week I think we have a chance to consider this question of one very rare procedure that President Clinton had the courage to veto when they passed legislation last year. And so they are going to criminalize it one procedure at a time, and today they propose to criminalize it one group at a time. And this particular group includes people like big sisters, grandmothers, stepparents, best friends, even members of the clergy, that might be consulted by a young woman in a very troubled situation and advise or help her to cross a State line to receive these kind of services. That person could be put in jail.

I maintain that what is at stake here today is this fanatic movement to ultimately criminalize the choice being exercised on this very private decision by a woman—to put women in jail and to put every health care provider involved in jail. And I see my colleague from New York (Mrs. LOWEY). She knows, well, we face this same issue later today on other legislation.

This same group of fanatics also wants to limit access to contraceptives because they seem to believe that the right of motherhood is more than that. It will be imposed without any choice on the part of women in our society.

So it is essential that we vote down this agenda and stop the path toward criminalizing choice for women in this country.

The surveys show that 30 percent of the young women who choose not to notify their parents, when you look at those who do not seek parental consent, are people that have been victims of family violence.

I thought it was all summed up by a colleague of mine in the Texas Senate from west Texas, who said, when asked about these parental consent laws, ''well, you know, I have not met very many young girls who ask parental consent for conception. Why do we think they are going to ask it with reference to the choice of abortion?''

The idea of putting a grandmother in jail, putting a big sister in jail, putting a clergy member in jail because they were willing to help a desperate young woman make a tough choice is wrong, and we ought to vote down this bill.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAPPAS).

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Child Custody Protection Act. Ending human life through abortion is harmful to all involved no matter what age they are. It is further worsened when an adult nonparent violates the law by taking a child across State lines to obtain an abortion.

Our world is often an uncertain place for young people. Abortion providers and other strangers cannot offer the permanent support that only parents can give. What they want to do is promote their abortion agenda with complete disregard for family input in such an important decision.

Contrary to what seems to be the emphasis of the opposition to this bill, parents are not generally evil. They are and should be encouraged to be part of the healing process, and their rights must be respected, too. This bill does just that.

This is why I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of life and in favor of protecting our daughters and families. Vote for the Child Custody Protection Act.

Mrs. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT), a constitutional scholar.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time.

I have very strong feelings about the bill itself. It is an unprecedented piece of legislation. It is an unconstitutional piece of legislation, and it has some severe unintended consequences.

I do not want to talk about the bill in this rules debate. I want to talk about democracy and how democracy works.

We had a bunch of amendments to try to address some of the concerns that we had about this bill. We took those amendments and we presented them up on the third floor to the Rules Committee, and the Rules Committee said, no, we will not allow you to have a debate on those amendments. They might improve the bill. They might allow the President to sign a bill into law if some of them were passed. They might enlighten the general public. They might foster democracy, but you are not going to be allowed to have a debate on those amendments.

That is what this rule is about. It is about democracy and how democracy works in this House.

We have amendments where in the minority not one single amendment of a Democratic Member, or any Member

of this House, was allowed to be considered under the rule under which we will be debating this issue.

It was not because I did not show up. I showed up at the Rules Committee, even though they scheduled the Rules Committee hearing on this bill at a time when we were not even back in session. They announced it while we were out of session so that we would not know that it was going on. I came back in here and got straight off the plane, picked up my papers, went to the Rules Committee and I said, I have two amendments that I think would help make this bill constitutional.

□ 1245

So I am not here as one that did not do what I was supposed to do in the democratic process. I respect the rights of the Committee on Rules, I respect the rules of this House, but when the Committee on Rules looks at me and says, ''Notwithstanding the fact that you came here and asked us to make your amendment in order, and you told us that you would like to help make this bill a constitutional bill rather than an unconstitutional bill,'' and when the chairman of the Committee on Rules looks at me saying, ''I'm the arbiter of what is constitutional in this country; I'm the only person that gets to make that decision,'' then that is a violation of democracy.

And that is what this rule is all about. And that is why, my colleagues, without regard to how they feel about abortion, without regard to how they feel about choice, without regard to whether this is a good or a bad bill or not, this rule ought to be defeated. Because if my colleagues support democracy and debate and an informed electorate, there ought to be a debate on these amendments, there ought to be consideration of these amendments on the floor of the United States House of Representatives.

That is what this is about.

Vote no on this rule so that we can send it back just to have the opportunity to debate some amendments that we think are important.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, just a point of clarification:

The Committee on Rules did give more than the normal required 48 hours notice, and, yes, we were out of town, most of the Members for 2 weeks, but our staffs were here. And, as my colleagues know, usually that is what they do, is notify us that this is going to happen.

Also, the reason the rule is closed is because Congress felt; I mean that we felt that Congress should not override the wishes of the voters in 20 States while allowing amendments that would weaken their parental notification laws.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Child Custody Protection Act.

I served in the Pennsylvania legislature when we established the parental consent law for the specific purpose of keeping our young girls safe and under the authority of their parents especially for such a decision as an abortion. That law was specifically designed to prevent situations like the one that occurred in 1995 where a 12-year-old Pennsylvania girl became pregnant after sexual involvement with an 18-year-old man. As many of my colleagues have heard by now, this frightened 12-year-old was taken by the man's mother from Pennsylvania to New York, and in New York she underwent a painful and serious medical procedure and abortion. She had this abortion without her parents even knowing that she was pregnant. Yet abortion clinics in Pennsylvania's neighboring States, New York, New Jersey, Maryland, seek still to pedal their services through Pennsylvania newspapers and even to anyone who opens up a Pennsylvania phone book.

Mr. Speaker, I brought a copy of an ad from the yellow pages in the capitol where I served in Harrisburg titled ''Abortion.'' Here it says: Hillcrest Women's Medical Center, and it gives a 1–800 number that can be called in Rockville, Maryland, and it specifically says: No parental consent.

I have here a letter with me today from the Attorney General of Pennsylvania, Mike Fisher. I would not call him a fanatic. He defended the judgment of the woman who interfered with the mother's custody of her child. Here is what he says.

Quote: We must do what we can to ensure that a parent's right to be involved in their daughter's decision regarding abortion is protected. I will continue to protect the rights of parents throughout Pennsylvania by defending our parental consent laws. I respectfully urge you to protect the rights of parents across the Nation by supporting H.R. 3682. The legislation will help those of us in law enforcement protect vulnerable children by insuring that parents have a say in their child's decision. End quote.

By passing the Child Custody Protection Act this body will take a clear stand against the bizarre notion that the U.S. Constitution confers a right upon strangers to take one's minor daughter across State lines for a secret abortion even when a State law specifically requires the involvement of a parent or a judge in the daughter's abortion decision. As moms and dads, it is our job to protect our young women, our daughters. The government should not allow our daughter's lives to be endangered by turning them over to strangers for serious medical procedures. Let us protect our States' rights, our parental authority, but, most importantly, let us protect our Nation's young women. Let us pass the Child Custody Protection Act.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule, and I ask my colleagues to join me in defeating it.

This bill is dangerous; and, as we have heard from so many of our colleagues, the Committee on Rules has refused to allow us to propose even the most reasonable changes to it. This bill will put our daughters at risk. Under this legislation young women, who feel they cannot turn to their parents when facing an unintended pregnancy, will be forced to fend for themselves without any help from a responsible adult. Some will seek dangerous back-alley abortions close to home. Others will travel alone to unfamiliar places for abortions. This measure will isolate young women, not protect them.

And, unfortunately, despite a veto threat from the White House, the Committee on Rules has prohibited us from offering even one amendment to make the bill better. The President has said he will sign the bill if it is altered, but, once again, the GOP leadership has demonstrated that it would rather have an election-year issue than a bill.

One of our principal objections to the legislation is that it will subject grandmothers and siblings and other close relatives to criminal prosecution for coming to the aid of a relative in distress. The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) went to the Committee on Rules to address this issue. Her amendment would have exempted grandparents and other close relatives from criminal prosecution under this bill. Unfortunately, that amendment was rejected by the Committee on Rules; and so under this legislation grandmothers will be jailed for helping their granddaughters, aunts imprisoned for assisting their nieces, brothers for aiding their sisters, all in the name of so-called family values.

What will the police do? Set up granny checkpoints to catch grandmothers helping their granddaughters? Will we have dogs and searchlights at State borders to lock up aunts and uncles?

Mr. Speaker, I am a grandmother of two, and I believe grandparents should be able to help their grandchildren without getting thrown in jail. As much as we wish otherwise, family communication, open and honest parent-child relationships, just cannot be legislated. When a young woman for many reasons cannot turn to their parents, she should certainly be able to turn to a grandmother, or a favorite aunt, or a relative.

Democrats made other efforts to improve the legislation. The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) offered an amendment to add a health exception to the bill. His amendment would have allowed a relative to accompany a young woman for an abortion if the young woman's health was endangered. Demonstrating its ''high'' regard for women's health, the Committee on Rules rejected that amendment as well.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that we should make abortion less necessary

for teenagers, not more dangerous and difficult. We need to encourage teenagers to be abstinent and responsible. We need a comprehensive approach to keeping teenagers safe and healthy. We need to encourage family involvement, not tear families apart.

Mr. Speaker, in the remaining time I would just like to respond to some comments of a good friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CANADY). We have heard a lot of talk today about States rights, and the Republican Party is the party, say they are the party, of States rights. And yet, here they are supporting legislation that tramples all over States rights. The bill will grant the Federal Government brand new authority to enforce State law. It interferes with the rights of citizens to travel between States by saddling a young woman with the laws of her home State no matter where she goes. I wonder if the gentleman from Florida might be as willing to apply this novel approach to other areas of the law like gun control.

For example, in New York we have very tough, sensible restrictions on gun ownership. His State of Florida has very weak gun control laws. Would the gentleman support legislation that applied New York's gun control laws to New Yorkers seeking to purchase guns in Florida? We have heard a lot of talk about States rights, but I wonder if the gentleman would respond or if someone else would respond whether our tough New York gun control laws could be enforced in the State of Florida, for example.

If we are really for States rights, let us think about that.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As my colleagues know, the other side does have a motion to recommit with instructions, and it is wide open for any amendments that they would like to include in that. So I just wanted to make that point for the record.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington State (Mrs. LINDA SMITH).

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to again say what H.R. 3682 does, because sometimes in the debate what it does gets lost.

This bill simply makes it a Federal offense to transfer a minor girl across State lines to obtain an abortion in order to circumvent that State's parental consent laws.

It is very simple. It is a fundamental principle that parents protect their children and have the rights, unless they are not good parents, and then they are given to a guardian, sometimes a grandparent, sometimes someone else. But someone is ultimately in charge of that child because someone needs to be responsible to protect that child. Without this bill our children are at risk.

Now we hear situations today described as if every family is normal and every uncle, every grandma and every cousin and everyone that would like to should be able to take a little girl, 12, 13, 14, to another State for an abortion.

I am a grandma of six. I have one grandchild reaching teenage years in a couple years, and I would not want her to be taken across a State line by some of the relatives I have had in my background. The fact that they are a relative does not mean that they could not be the problem.

I guess ultimately we have to start thinking about whether or not parents have any rights or not. This is an issue of parental rights, and it is about the rights of the parents. Do they have the rights in the child's life to be ultimately responsible for that child?

Now we have heard the example of the 12-year-old. It is real where the mother of the 18-year-old took the child across State lines; and, by the way, charges against her were dropped. She did not do anything wrong. Well, I would tell my colleagues, as a mother of someone that had teenagers, I would be incensed because my little girl could not even get aspirin at the school without permission, she definitely could not get dental work, and no hospital would accept her, no clinic, no reputable physician, without her mother or her father's permission.

Now let us just get right down to what an abortion is and what it does. Most of the time we are dealing with a person that is going to bleed extensively. We are dealing with a young woman that needs after-care. We are dealing with someone that needs her mother. Now my colleagues can stand and say she has a right to this, but I say she has a right to her mother, and, if someone has parents that are not good enough to be parents, we have procedures to let someone else be their guardian.

□ 1300

Little girls of 12, 13, 14, and I know some would say they are women with the same rights as any other women, no, they are little girls, are going to go through cramps, they are going to go through bleeding, they are going to sometimes go through the need of surgery, and you are telling me that I do not have a right as a mother to know? I do. And that is what this bill is a part of. But now you are going to say that if we do not pass this bill, everything will be just fine?

This just says you cannot take kids across State lines where States say parents should be involved, at least being notified. You are saying they can take them to a State, bring them back, and they are not notified, they are not involved, until the little girl starts bleeding to death or she is sterile because she did not take care of herself, because she did not want to tell anybody because she got across State lines. No, you see, this is not even reasonable.

This bill makes sense. If we have got bad parents, we have procedures for them. But to assume all parents are bad and we have to take their children away somewhere to have abortions is a wrong assumption.

This is a very good bill. It is reasonable, whether you are pro-life or pro-choice, because we are all pro-parent and we are all pro-family.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, if I could respond to my friend from Washington State, anyone who impregnates a 12-year-old girl has committed statutory rape and should be imprisoned for a very long time, and I hope he was. But the issue is then, the 12-year-old girl; should she be forced to carry a child to term? That is probably where we have a division of opinion. I think requiring girls as young as 9 years old to bear children is a question that society needs to talk about. I think it is barbaric.

We certainly live in a strange time. This body has for years attempted to take away a woman's control over her reproductive system at the same time that it rejoices over the introduction of Viagra!

Congress believes it is wise enough to outlaw medical procedures it doesn't like—perhaps vasectomy should require parental consent so at least that would ease the double standard.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

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

Mr. PAUL. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule but in opposition to H.R. 3682, the Child Custody Protection Act, because it is seriously flawed. Although well motivated, the problem we are dealing with is the breakdown of the American family, respect for life and abortion, not too much freedom to travel between States.

Having delivered nearly 4,000 babies in my three decades of medical practice and having seen the destructiveness of abortion, I strongly agree that legalized abortion is the most egregious of all current social policies. It clearly symbolizes the moral decline America has experienced in the last 30 years.

However, Federal law restricting interstate travel, no matter how well intended, will serve no useful purpose, will not prevent abortions, and, indeed, will have many unintended consequences.

It is ironic that if this bill is passed into law, it will go into effect at approximately the same time that the Department of Transportation will impose a National I.D. card on all Americans. This bill only gives the Federal Government and big government proponents one more reason to impose the National I.D. card on all of us. So be prepared to show your papers as you travel about the U.S. You may be transporting a teenager.

There is already a legal vehicle for dealing with this problem. Many States

currently prohibit adults from taking underage teenagers across State lines for the purpose of marriage. States have reciprocal agreements respecting this approach. This is the proper way to handle this problem.

Most importantly, this bill fails to directly address the cause of the problem we face regarding abortion, which is the absurdity of our laws permitting the killing of an infant 1 minute before birth, or even during birth, and a doctor getting paid for it, while calling this same action murder 1 minute after birth.

The solution will ultimately come when the Federal Government and Federal courts get out of the way and allow States to protect the unborn. If that were the case, we would not have to consider dangerous legislation like this with the many unforeseen circumstances.

Our federal government is, constitutionally, a government of limited powers. Article one, Section eight, enumerates the legislative areas for which the U.S. Congress is allowed to act or enact legislation. For every other issue, the federal government lacks any authority or consent of the governed and only the state governments, their designees, or the people in their private market actions enjoy such rights to governance. The tenth amendment is brutally clear in stating ''The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.'' Our nation's history makes clear that the U.S. Constitution is a document intended to limit the power of central government. No serious reading of historical events surrounding the creation of the Constitution could reasonably portray it differently.

Nevertheless, rather than abide by our constitutional limits, Congress today will likely pass H.R. 3682. H.R. 3682 amends title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State lines to avoid laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions. Should parents be involved in decisions regarding the health of their children? Absolutely. Should the law respect parents rights to not have their children taken across state lines for contemptible purposes? Absolutely. Can a state pass an enforceable statute to prohibit taking minors across State lines to avoid laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions? Absolutely. But when asked if there exists constitutional authority for the federal criminalizing of just such an action the answer is absolutely not.

This federalizing may have the effect of nationalizing a law with criminal penalties which may be less than those desired by some states. To the extent the federal and state laws could co-exist, the necessity for a federal law is undermined and an important bill of rights protection is virtually obliterated. Concurrent jurisdiction crimes erode the right of citizens to be free of double jeopardy. The fifth amendment to the U.S. Constitution specifies that no ''person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb . . .'' In other words, no person shall be tried twice for the same offense. However in United States v. Lanza, the high court in 1922 sustained a ruling that being tried by both the federal government and a state government for the same offense did not offend the doctrine of double jeopardy. One danger of unconstitutionally expanding the federal criminal justice code is that it seriously increases the danger that one will be subject to being tried twice for the same offense. Despite the various pleas for federal correction of societal wrongs, a national police force is neither prudent nor constitutional.

The argument which springs from the criticism of a federalized criminal code and a federal police force is that states may be less effective than a centralized federal government in dealing with those who leave one state jurisdiction for another. Fortunately, the Constitution provides for the procedural means for preserving the integrity of state sovereignty over those issues delegated to it via the tenth amendment. The privilege and immunities clause as well as full faith and credit clause allow states to exact judgments from those who violate their state laws. The Constitution even allows the federal government to legislatively preserve the procedural mechanisms which allow states to enforce their substantive laws without the federal government imposing its substantive edicts on the states. Article IV, Section 2, Clause 2 makes provision for the rendition of fugitives from one state to another. While not self-enacting, in 1783 Congress passed an act which did exactly this. There is, of course, a cost imposed upon states in working with one another rather than relying on a national, unified police force. At the same time, there is a greater cost to centralization of police power.

It is important to be reminded of the benefits of federalism as well as the costs. There are sound reasons to maintain a system of smaller, independent jurisdictions. An inadequate federal law, or a ''adequate'' federal improperly interpreted by the Supreme Court, preempts states' rights to adequately address public health concerns. Roe v. Wade should serve as a sad reminder of the danger of making matters worse in all states by federalizing an issue.

It is my erstwhile hope that parents will become more involved in vigilantly monitoring the activities of their own children rather than shifting parental responsibility further upon the federal government. There was a time when a popular bumper sticker read ''It's ten o'clock; do you know where your children are?'' I suppose we have devolved to a point where it reads ''It's ten o'clock; does the federal government know where your children are.'' Further socializing and burden-shifting of the responsibilities of parenthood upon the federal government is simply not creating the proper incentive for parents to be more involved.

For each of these reasons, among others, I must oppose the further and unconstitutional centralization of police power in the national government and, accordingly, H.R. 3682.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this rule and H.R. 3682, the Child Custody Protection Act. I want to commend my good friend, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for introducing this important legislation.

The legislation before the House today is the product of extensive consideration and examination by the Committee on the Judiciary. The Subcommittee on the Constitution held a markup during which more than 10 amendments were considered. The full committee markup lasted 2 days, and more than 20 amendments were considered.

This bill has been examined and debated more exhaustively than much of the legislation that comes before this body. It is now time for Congress to pass this bill and protect the fundamental rights of parents to be involved in their children's lives.

Mr. Speaker, the American people overwhelmingly support this legislation. This is a common-sense bill that will protect the integrity of State laws which require a child seeking to obtain an abortion to involve her parents in that decision.

State parental notification laws are designed to secure the rights of parents to protect their daughters' physical and emotional health. However, these laws are frequently circumvented by individuals who transport minors to States without parental involvement laws. Some abortion clinics even advertise their own State's lack of parental involvement laws to encourage minors from other States to cross State lines so they may obtain an abortion without involving their parents.

Loving parents, not friends, counselors, boyfriends or other adults, should be the ones most intimately involved in a minor child's decision as important as obtaining an abortion. An abortion is a complicated medical procedure that poses significant risks to the mother upon which the abortion is performed. Someone transporting a young girl to another State to obtain an abortion exposes her to many physical and emotional dangers that could be avoided by involving her parents, who may possess essential information about her medical and psychological history.

Mr. Speaker, it is simply outrageous that any individual should be allowed to subvert State laws designed to protect families and children simply by going behind a parent's back. This bill protects the rights of parents to be involved in the decisions of their own children, it protects the rights of States to enforce their own laws, and it protects the safety of our children.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and to vote yes on the Child Custody Protection Act.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myslef such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, these amendments would all have been in order under an open rule. I will insert these materials for the RECORD.

TEST OF PREVIOUS QUESTION FOR H. RES. 499
H.R. 3682—CHILD CUSTODY PROTECTION ACT

Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3682) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State

lines to avoid laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions.

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3682) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State lines to avoid laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those specified in section 2 of this resolution. Each amendment may be offered only in the order listed in section 2, may be offered only by a Member specified in section 2 or his designee, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against the amendments specified in section 2 are waived. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. The following amendments are in order pursuant to the first section of this resolution:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3682, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MR. WATT OF NORTH CAROLINA

Page 4, strike line 1 and all that follows through line 6 and insert the following:

''(b) EXCEPTION.—(1) The prohibition of subsection (a) does not apply if the abortion was necessary to save the life of the minor or to prevent serious physical illness or disability or because her life or physical health was endangered by a physical disorder, physical injury, or physical illness, including a life endangering physical condition or serious physical health condition caused by or arising from the pregnancy itself.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3682, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MR. WATT OF NORTH CAROLINA

Page 3, strike line 6 and all that follows through line 23 and insert the following:

''(a) OFFENSE.—Except as provided in subsection (b), whoever knowingly transports an individual who has not attained the age of 18 years across a State line, with the intent to evade the requirements of a law requiring parental involvement in a minor's abortion decision, in the State where the individual resides shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3682, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Add at the end the following:

(c) STUDY.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the General Accounting Office shall study the impact the amendment made by this Act has on the number of illegal and unsafe abortions and increased parental abuse, and report to Congress the results of that study.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3682, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Page 4, after line 11, insert the following:

''(3) The prohibitions of this section do not apply with respect to conduct by ministers, rabbis, pastors, priests, or other religious leaders.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3682, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Page 4, after line 11, insert the following:

''(3) The prohibitions of this section do not apply with respect to conduct by a grandparent of the minor.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3682, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Page 4, after line 11, insert the following:

''(3) The prohibitions of this section do not apply with respect to conduct by an aunt or uncle of the minor.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote no on the previous question, so we may add these responsible amendments to the rule.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's ''Precedents of the House of Representatives,'' (VI, 308–311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R–Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership ''Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives,'' (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual:

''Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.''

Deschler's ''Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives,'' the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues:

''Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the item for debate thereon.''

The vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on House Resolution 499.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from North Carolina and I rise in support of the rule and the underlying bill. While it is a closed rule, I think that it is an appropriate one, given the very narrow, significant scope of this bill.

The family is the building block of every community in this Nation. Not only is this a recognized principle in our culture, but something we have actively encouraged by enacting laws promoting more family involvement in education decisions, stronger child support enforcement, and special tax benefits for families.

We recognize the rights of parental notification and consent when a child gets a tattoo, or a body piercing, or even takes an aspirin at school. How can we tell moms and dads across the country they have no right to know if a perfect stranger takes their daughter miles away from home, to another State, to have a life altering medical procedure without their knowledge. Today, we seek to ensure that basic right is not emasculated.

Opponents of the Child Custody Protection Act want to turn this into a debate about abortion. This is not about abortion. It's about family, parental support and parental responsibility

and about children growing up in a society of confusing mixed messages. States have the right to pass consent or notification laws for minors, yet these laws become meaningless when a young girl is assisted taking a trip to another State to avoid the difficult task of counseling with her parents about an unplanned pregnancy.

I urge all of my colleagues to think about the natural role of a parent, the importance of States' rights and, most importantly, the well-being of the children—at risk in these situations. I think these justify a closed rule and I urge support for the rule and H.R. 3682.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 5, rule XV, the Chair will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of agreeing to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 252, nays 174, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 277]

YEAS—252

Aderholt	Cook	Graham
Archer	Cooksey	Granger
Armey	Costello	Gutknecht
Bachus	Cox	Hall (OH)
Baker	Crane	Hall (TX)
Ballenger	Crapo	Hamilton
Barcia	Cubin	Hansen
Barr	Cunningham	Hastert
Barrett (NE)	Davis (VA)	Hastings (WA)
Bartlett	Deal	Hayworth
Barton	DeLay	Hefley
Bass	Diaz-Balart	Herger
Bateman	Dickey	Hill
Bereuter	Doolittle	Hilleary
Berry	Doyle	Hobson
Bilbray	Dreier	Hoekstra
Bilirakis	Duncan	Holden
Bliley	Dunn	Horn
Blunt	Ehlers	Hostettler
Boehner	Ehrlich	Houghton
Bonilla	Emerson	Hulshof
Bono	English	Hunter
Brady (TX)	Ensign	Hutchinson
Bryant	Everett	Hyde
Bunning	Ewing	Inglis
Burr	Fawell	Istook
Burton	Foley	Jenkins
Buyer	Forbes	Johnson (WI)
Callahan	Fossella	Johnson, Sam
Calvert	Fowler	Jones
Camp	Fox	Kanjorski
Campbell	Franks (NJ)	Kasich
Canady	Frelinghuysen	Kildee
Cannon	Gallegly	Kim
Chabot	Ganske	King (NY)
Chambliss	Gekas	Kingston
Chenoweth	Gibbons	Kleczka
Christensen	Gilchrest	Klink
Coble	Gillmor	Klug
Coburn	Goodlatte	Knollenberg
Collins	Goodling	Kolbe
Combest	Goss	Kucinich
LaFalce	Packard	Skeen
LaHood	Pappas	Skelton
Largent	Parker	Smith (MI)
Latham	Paul	Smith (NJ)
LaTourette	Paxon	Smith (OR)
Lazio	Pease	Smith (TX)
Leach	Peterson (MN)	Smith, Linda
Lewis (CA)	Peterson (PA)	Snowbarger
Lewis (KY)	Petri	Snyder
Linder	Pickering	Solomon
Lipinski	Pitts	Souder
Livingston	Pombo	Spence
LoBiondo	Portman	Stearns
Lucas	Poshard	Stenholm
Manton	Pryce (OH)	Stump
Manzullo	Quinn	Stupak
Mascara	Radanovich	Sununu
McCarthy (NY)	Rahall	Talent
McCollum	Ramstad	Tauzin
McCrery	Redmond	Taylor (MS)
McDade	Regula	Taylor (NC)
McHugh	Riggs	Thomas
McInnis	Riley	Thornberry
McIntosh	Roemer	Thune
McIntyre	Rogers	Tiahrt
McKeon	Rohrabacher	Traficant
Metcalf	Ros-Lehtinen	Turner
Mica	Roukema	Upton
Miller (FL)	Royce	Walsh
Mollohan	Ryun	Wamp
Moran (KS)	Salmon	Watkins
Murtha	Sanford	Watts (OK)
Myrick	Saxton	Weldon (FL)
Nethercutt	Scarborough	Weldon (PA)
Neumann	Schaefer, Dan	Weller
Ney	Schaffer, Bob	White
Northup	Sensenbrenner	Whitfield
Norwood	Sessions	Wicker
Nussle	Shadegg	Wilson
Oberstar	Shaw	Wolf
Ortiz	Shimkus	Young (AK)
Oxley	Shuster	Young (FL)

NAYS—174

Abercrombie	Filner	Menendez
Ackerman	Ford	Millender-McDonald
Allen	Frank (MA)	Miller (CA)
Andrews	Frost	Minge
Baesler	Furse	Mink
Baldacci	Gejdenson	Moran (VA)
Barrett (WI)	Gephardt	Morella
Becerra	Gilman	Nadler
Bentsen	Gordon	Neal
Berman	Green	Obey
Bishop	Greenwood	Olver
Blagojevich	Gutierrez	Owens
Blumenauer	Harman	Pallone
Boehlert	Hastings (FL)	Pascrell
Bonior	Hefner	Pastor
Borski	Hilliard	Pelosi
Boswell	Hinchey	Pickett
Boucher	Hinojosa	Pomeroy
Boyd	Hooley	Porter
Brady (PA)	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Brown (CA)	Jackson (IL)	Rangel
Brown (FL)	Jackson-Lee (TX)	Reyes
Brown (OH)	Jefferson	Rivers
Capps	John	Rodriguez
Cardin	Johnson (CT)	Rothman
Carson	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Castle	Kaptur	Rush
Clay	Kelly	Sabo
Clayton	Kennedy (MA)	Sanchez
Clement	Kennedy (RI)	Sanders
Condit	Kennelly	Sandlin
Conyers	Kilpatrick	Sawyer
Coyne	Kind (WI)	Schumer
Cramer	Lampson	Scott
Cummings	Lantos	Serrano
Danner	Lee	Shays
Davis (FL)	Levin	Sherman
Davis (IL)	Lewis (GA)	Sisisky
DeFazio	Lofgren	Skaggs
DeGette	Lowey	Slaughter
Delahunt	Luther	Smith, Adam
DeLauro	Maloney (CT)	Spratt
Deutsch	Maloney (NY)	Stabenow
Dicks	Markey	Stark
Dixon	Martinez	Stokes
Doggett	Matsui	Strickland
Dooley	McCarthy (MO)	Tanner
Edwards	McDermott	Tauscher
Engel	McGovern	Thompson
Eshoo	McHale	Thurman
Etheridge	McKinney	Tierney
Evans	Meehan	Torres
Farr	Meek (FL)	Towns
Fattah	Meeks (NY)	Velazquez
Fazio	Menendez	Vento
Visclosky	Waxman	Woolsey
Waters	Wexler	Wynn
Watt (NC)	Weygand	Yates
	Wise	

NOT VOTING—8

Clyburn	Goode	Payne
Dingell	McNulty	Rogan
Gonzalez	Moakley	

□ 1330

Mr. PORTER changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. RAHALL, HALL OF TEXAS, GILCHREST, KLINK, MURTHA, DOYLE, KANJORSKI, MASCARA, GOODLING, HOUGHTON, LAFALCE, RADANOVICH, SKELTON, OBERSTAR, and DAVIS of Virginia changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 277, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule XV, this will be a five-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 247, noes 173, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 278]

AYES—247

Archer	Cook	Goodling
Armey	Cooksey	Goss
Bachus	Costello	Graham
Baker	Cox	Granger
Ballenger	Crane	Gutknecht
Barcia	Crapo	Hall (OH)
Barr	Cubin	Hall (TX)
Barrett (NE)	Cunningham	Hamilton
Bartlett	Danner	Hansen
Barton	Davis (VA)	Hastert
Bateman	Deal	Hastings (WA)
Bereuter	DeLay	Hayworth
Berry	Diaz-Balart	Hefley
Bilbray	Doolittle	Herger
Bilirakis	Doyle	Hill
Bliley	Dreier	Hilleary
Blunt	Duncan	Hobson
Boehner	Dunn	Hoekstra
Bonilla	Ehlers	Holden
Bono	Ehrlich	Hostettler
Brady (TX)	Emerson	Hulshof
Bryant	English	Hunter
Bunning	Ensign	Hutchinson
Burr	Everett	Hyde
Burton	Ewing	Inglis
Buyer	Fawell	Istook
Callahan	Foley	Jenkins
Calvert	Forbes	John
Camp	Fossella	Johnson (WI)
Campbell	Fowler	Johnson, Sam
Canady	Fox	Jones
Cannon	Franks (NJ)	Kanjorski
Chabot	Frelinghuysen	Kasich
Chambliss	Gallegly	Kildee
Chenoweth	Ganske	Kim
Christensen	Gekas	King (NY)
Coble	Gibbons	Kingston
Coburn	Gilchrest	Kleczka
Collins	Gillmor	Klink
Combest	Goodlatte	Klug