Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I know many have heard about the news and it will be or has been discussed today about the abortionist in Arizona who delivered the little girl and later discovered that he had misguessed the child's age. And rather than 23 gestational weeks old, the little girl had reached the age of about 36 weeks on June 30, when her 17-year-old mother subjected herself and her baby to a planned partial birth abortion at an AZ Women's Center in Phoenix.

This is not the first time this abortionist had this happen to him. He is currently being sued because one of his patients bled to death following an abortion in 1996. But the story of this latest mishap, which came to light just this past week and received wide coverage across the country, is just one more reason why we need to ban this procedure, which is a cruel form of infanticide, pure and simple.

Abortionists across the country knowingly commit partial birth abortions on babies as young as 20 gestational weeks, and they will continue to kill these babies and endanger the lives if we do not act today to override President Clinton's veto of the Partial Birth Abortion Act.

A baby delivered prematurely between 23 and 24 weeks would have a one-in-three chance of survival in a neonatal unit if delivered under normal circumstances and certainly would not feel the excruciating pain of a partial birth abortion.

So the question we will vote on today is quite simply whether we oppose allowing a fetus to suffer excruciating pain or whether we support life.

I am proud to stand here today with those who oppose infanticide and support life.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Madam Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair concerning the amount of time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. CANADY) has 15 minutes remaining, and the gentleman have Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time for the purpose of closing.

Mr. SCOTT. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) suggested that we disagree with his decision. I do not agree or disagree with his decision. What I disagree with is Congress making the medical decision.

This bill will not prohibit a single abortion. There will be alternatives which were not described other than they are just as gruesome as this, and those alternatives would be used.

The bill, without the health exception, puts us in a situation where we will either allow the woman, if the bill does not pass, might have a choice of having a procedure that will not sterilize her by using this procedure. If this bill passes, the only alternative may require her sterilization. I do not think we ought to be making that choice for her that one procedure is more preferable than the one that might sterilize her.

Finally, Madam Speaker, this bill is unconstitutional, and everybody knows it. People have indicated they disagree with Roe v. Wade. The bill is unconstitutional. If we want to prohibit late-term abortions, we ought to pass the Hoyer-Greenwood bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) is recognized for 13 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong opposition to the bill. Because this legislation, my colleagues, puts the lives and health of women at risk and it tramples on the constitutional right of every woman in this Nation.

Unfortunately, the GOP leadership has been waging war on abortion rights since taking over this House in 1994. This is the 93rd vote on reproductive rights in less than 4 years. 93 times. The goal is clear, ban every abortion procedure by procedure, month after month.

Madam Speaker, we have a different vision.

Mr. SCOTT. Madam Speaker, will the gentlewoman suspend for just a minute?

I understand that, prior to the close, they will ask for a Call of the House; and I think it would be appropriate for both closing speakers to be heard, and at this time I would suspend for the motion.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Madam Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) yield for that purpose?

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I yield for that purpose.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 324]

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fazio
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Latham
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes

Strickland	Tiahrt	Weldon (FL)
Stump	Towns	Weldon (PA)
Stupak	Traficant	Weller
Sununu	Turner	Wexler
Talent	Upton	Weygand
Tanner	Velazquez	White
Tauscher	Vento	Whitfield
Tauzin	Visclosky	Wicker
Taylor (MS)	Walsh	Wilson
Taylor (NC)	Wamp	Wise
Thomas	Waters	Wolf
Thompson	Watkins	Woolsey
Thornberry	Watt (NC)	Wynn
Thune	Watts (OK)	Yates
Thurman	Waxman	Young (AK)

□ 1335

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). On this rollcall, 400 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

Under the rule, further proceedings under the call are dispensed with.

PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION BAN ACT OF 1997—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 105–158)

Mr. SCOTT. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

(Mrs. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise against the bill.

Madam Speaker I rise against this bill.

This is the first time that Congress has attempted to criminalize a medical procedure—a rare procedure used to save a woman's life and save her reproductive future.

That's what it was for Kim Koster, who lives in Iowa. In November 1996, she became pregnant. In February, she faced heartbreaking news: Their baby had anencephaly—no brain. Kim says, ''our world came crashing down around us.'' Thankfully, the D and E procedure was available, and Kim's fertility remained intact.

In March of this year, Kim became pregnant, and just last week, she learned that—again—she has another baby with no brain. Nineteen states, including Iowa, have blocked these state laws, ruling that they are unconstitutional, vague, and overly broad. Thankfully, Kim was able to have the abortion she needed.

Unfortunately, this federal bill prevents women like Kim Koster from receiving necessary, safe medical care in rare cases when a much wanted pregnancy has gone tragically wrong. When a woman seeks medical care, she wants the best care her doctor can provide.

Congress has no place in their decisions. And Congress has no place politicizing family tragedies. Apparently, the supporters of this bill feel it is more important to save a doomed fetus than the life of the mother and her ability to have children in the future.

I urge a ''no'' vote on this override vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) has 12 minutes remaining.

(Mrs. LOWEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill. This legislation puts the lives and health of women at risk, and it tramples on the constitutional rights of every woman in this Nation.

The GOP leadership, unfortunately, has been waging war on abortion rights since taking over this House in 1994. This is the 93rd vote on reproductive rights in less than 4 years; 93 times. The goal is clear: ban every abortion procedure by procedure, month by month.

Madam Speaker, we have a different vision. We want to reduce the number of abortions, not by making them illegal, but by empowering women to make healthy choices about their own reproductive health care.

Last week, we had a crucial vote in this House on a measure that will help reduce the number of abortions in the United States. That initiative will ensure that Federal employee health plans cover prescription contraceptives. It passed because the American people are tired of these polarizing debates. They want common sense solutions to preventing unintended pregnancy and reducing the number of abortions. Increased access to contraceptive coverage is one such approach; the bill before us, frankly, is not.

My good friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CANADY), and we have worked together on many issues. However, my contraceptive coverage amendment, in my judgment, will prevent more abortions in a week than this bill ever will. It will do so by improving women's health, not by endangering it.

I am only sorry that the gentleman from Florida could not join us last week in supporting contraceptive coverage because that is the way that we will really reduce unintended pregnancies and prevent abortions.

So let us work together. Let us reduce the number of abortions. But, instead, we are, once again, considering this divisive issue. In fact, this is the sixth time this bill has come before the House. Each of those times, we tried to offer an amendment to the bill to protect the health of the mother, and each time the Republican leadership blocked us. We offered to sit down with the Republican leadership, craft a health exception that we could all accept. The Republican leadership refused.

The President will sign this bill if it protects the health of the mother, but the Republican leadership will not even give us a chance to make this change. Let me repeat, the President will sign this bill if it contains an exception to protect the health of the mother, but the GOP leadership refuses to put one in. So the Republicans, unfortunately, would rather debate this issue again and again and again rather than send the President a bill that he could sign.

Madam Speaker, this bill is not about reducing abortions. It is about defeating Democrats. This is election-year politics, plain and simple. But do not take my word for it. Leading GOP strategist Ralph Reed called this ''a winning gold-plated issue.'' A winning gold-plated issue. Is that not unfortunate that that is why we are here today.

I heard reference in the debate before to liberals. In fact, two of my colleagues, my good friends, refer to people who oppose this ban as liberals. I just want to tell my colleagues, as a woman, that when you are there making this very difficult decision, and we have seen these women come to my offices to discuss the decision that they had to make to preserve their future fertility, they were not making this decision with their family, with their physician, with the member of their clergy, as a Democrat, as a Republican, as a conservative or a liberal. They were making this decision as a woman in distress who had to make a very, very difficult decision.

I think it is time for us to stop playing politics with the lives and health of American women. We must ensure that women have access to abortion if their lives and health are endangered.

So I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, whose health would you sacrifice? Which one of us? Which of our daughters is expendable? The health of every woman in this Nation is precious. Each of us, mothers, wives, daughters, is irreplaceable.

Women like Tammy Watts, Claudia Addes, Maureen Britel, these women testified before Congress that this procedure protected their lives and health. These women desperately wanted to have children. They had purchased baby clothes. They had picked out names. They did not abort because of a headache. How demeaning to a woman to even consider that that is an option. They did not abort because their prom dresses did not fit. They chose to become mothers and only terminated their pregnancies because of tragic circumstances.

So who in this chamber will stand in the operating room and limit their options? Who, at this agonizing moment, will decide? Who will make that difficult decision, the Congress of the United States or the woman, families, physicians, and members of the clergy of America?

□ 1345

The courts have been very clear on this point. Bans like this one have been passed in 28 states. Court challenges have been initiated in 20. In 18 state courts, there have been partially or fully enjoined bans on constitutional grounds. The courts have found that these laws ban most safe and common abortion procedures used throughout pregnancy. Courts have found that the bans are vague, they fail to protect the health of the mother and they are unconstitutional. The legislation before us is also clearly unconstitutional.

I want to conclude by stating that we believe strongly in the right to choose, but we also recognize that rights confer responsibilities as well. No woman