

this waste of taxpayer money. It is time for the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) to step down as head of this investigation.

CHILD CUSTODY PROTECTION ACT

(Ms. ROS-LEHTIMEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, although we live in the world's greatest democracy, we also live in a society that, unfortunately, in the name of women's rights permits parents to be stripped of our inherent and sacred right, our right to parent.

H.R. 3682, The Child Custody Protection Act, will protect every parent's right to be a parent. It will prevent every parent from being stripped, deprived, and divested of our profound right to protect our young daughters from abortions and life-altering and life-threatening procedure.

Pro-abortion groups wrongfully claim a right to procure secret abortions for minors. But it is not up to a stranger to determine whether our daughters should have an abortion. The Congress and the American people will take a strong stand against the twisted notion that the Constitution somehow confers upon strangers a right to parent our children.

Together with Senator SPENCER ABRAHAM, our bill will be heard in committees next week and we hope that we can get even more cosponsors for our pro-family protection bill.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

(Mr. TIERNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, campaign finance reform still is a critical issue confronting this House and needs to be addressed.

The Committee on Government Reform and Oversight had a particular opportunity to address this issue, to hold hearings, and to come up with some solutions and some facts that were a basis as to how we should proceed in that area.

So far, however, due to lack of leadership in that committee, we have been unable to embark on that process. We have had instead a very partisan hearing process, a fiscally irresponsible process, one that is motivated by personal vindictiveness not only of persons on the majority but also of their staff.

In fact, we have had a tremendous amount of incompetence in those proceedings that have cost the American taxpayers some \$6 million. New committee leadership is needed to restore credibility to that committee and dignity and credibility to this House.

It is a shame, Mr. Speaker, that the Members of the majority were unable to take the action that would allow us

to move in that process. It now is incumbent upon the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) as the head of that committee to realize that he can no longer function properly and to move that leadership to another member of that committee.

FREEDOM FROM RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION ACT OF 1998

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 430, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 430

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. 2431) to establish an Office of Religious Persecution Monitoring, to provide for the imposition of sanctions against countries engaged in a pattern of religious persecution, and for other purposes. 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 International Relations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendments recommended by the Committees on International Relations, the Judiciary, and Ways and Means now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of H.R. 3806, modified by the amendments printed in part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part 2 of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report 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 printed in the report are waived. 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 amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my good

friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), 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.

Mr. Speaker, this rule, House Resolution 430, is a structured rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 2431, The Freedom from Religious Persecution Act of 1998. The admirable purpose of this legislation is to reduce the widespread and ongoing religious persecution taking place, unfortunately, in many places in the world today.

□ 1115

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations, which had primary jurisdiction over the legislation.

Because the bill was referred to five committees for their consideration, and three of those committees reported varying versions of the bill, a new bill for the purpose of amendment, H.R. 3806, was introduced last week.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON), chairman of the Committee on Rules announced on the House floor on May 7 that the bill, H.R. 3806, would be used as the base text for purposes of amendment. The rule, therefore, makes in order as an original bill for purposes of amendment an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of H.R. 3806 as modified by the amendments in Part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules and provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fair rule which allows for a broad range of amendments on a very narrowly focused bill. The goal of the bill is to combat religious persecution, and clearly all forms of persecution are to be condemned. But the crafters of this bill, as I stated, created a very focused religion-specific bill to make clear that we are focusing on one particular aspect of unacceptable persecution which must, must be combated.

Thus, the bill was not brought with an amendment, for example, from the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) who offered an amendment which would have expanded the scope of the bill to cover all forms of persecution prohibited by the Geneva Convention. It was felt by the framers of the legislation, however, that this bill, to have an opportunity to be considered and to have an opportunity for passage, should be framed as specifically and narrowly as it has been.

I believe that the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT), when he moves forward, if he does, with his concept, will get tremendous support on a bipartisan basis. I certainly would be supportive of the effort by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT), but I think that it is important to keep in mind what the purpose of this bill is.