

Mr. Starr had asked the court to rule that anything a client says to his or her lawyer should be available to a prosecutor after the client dies. He also asked the court to believe that only clients who intended to perjure themselves would be stopped from talking to their lawyers if they knew that their conversations might become public after their death.

The Supreme Court, in an opinion written by Chief Justice Rehnquist, wrote that

The attorney-client privilege is one of the oldest recognized privileges for confidential communications. It is intended to encourage full and frank communication between attorneys and their clients, and thereby promote broader public interests in the observance of law and the administration of justice.

He added that "It has been generally, if not universally, accepted, for well over a century, that the attorney-client privilege survives the death of the client in a case such as this." In light of this settled law, the Chief Justice said that "The burden is on the Independent Counsel to show that 'reason and experience' require a departure from this rule," and the court concluded that Mr. Starr could not meet that standard.

Rejecting Mr. Starr's view that only guilty people will invoke the privilege, the Chief Justice made the common-sense observation that people go to see attorneys about a wide range of matters that might prove embarrassing if made public after they die. For example, people routinely meet with lawyers to talk about family or money problems, and who would ever want these kinds of things made public? Think of the possible embarrassment to a person's family or the potential damage to that person's reputation, even after his or her death.

The Chief Justice wrote that,

There are weighty reasons that counsel in favor of posthumous application. Knowing that communications will remain confidential even after death encourages the client to communicate fully and frankly with counsel. While the fear of disclosure, and the consequent withholding of information from counsel, may be reduced if disclosure is limited to posthumous disclosure in a criminal context, it seems unreasonable to assume that it vanishes altogether. Clients may be concerned about reputation, civil liability, or possible harm to friends or family. Posthumous disclosure of such communications may be as feared as disclosure during the client's lifetime.

During his 4-year, \$40 million investigation, Mr. Starr made it seem that anyone who asserts a privilege when he demands information is somehow trying to obstruct justice. Without question, it is important for a prosecutor to uncover facts necessary to decide whether a crime has been committed, but we expect the basic principles of law and civility will be followed during criminal investigations.

The decision today by the United States Supreme Court reaffirms what most of us already knew, which is that the relationship between a lawyer and

a client is sacred, and that prosecutors themselves are sometimes guilty of excesses.

#### TRANSFER OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

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

There was no objection.

#### LET US PASS THE CHILD CUSTODY PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Child Custody Protection Act. This bill is very important to any parent who has a teenage daughter, and I look forward to a vote on the bill shortly after the July 4 recess.

Members may already know that people of 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 pregnancies, 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.

Earlier, though, this month the Senate Committee on the Judiciary heard chilling testimony about how law-breaking 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 Ms. Farley's young child out of school, provided her with alcohol, transported her out of State to have an abortion, falsified the 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. It is wrong, and it has to be stopped.

According to the Reproductive Law and Policy Center, a pro-choice group in New York, thousands of adults across the country carry children over

State lines to get abortions in States without parental notification laws. So-called men in their twenties and thirties coerce teenage girls to have abortions out of State and without their parents' knowledge.

The Child Custody Protection Act would put a stop to this 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.

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 else's teenage child into a different State for an abortion.

#### A TRIBUTE TO JERRY GRANT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a truly unique individual who has served our country, my great State of Maryland, and the Congress of the United States for over four decades. Mr. Jerry Grant is one of the finest examples of people dedicated to standing up for what is right and fighting, both in the forefront and behind the scenes, to make our country a better place for all our citizens.

Jerry turned 60 years old on July 1, and I would like to be one of the many to wish him a very happy birthday.

Mr. Speaker, I first met Jerry when both of us were attending a national Young Democrats convention, he as the president of the Young Democrats of Colorado, and I as the president of the Young Democrats of Maryland. Even at that young age, Jerry made an indelible impression, with his uncanny ability to persuade people to listen to his point of view and come onto his side of an issue. The good thing about Jerry Grant is that he uses this talent in a positive manner, to influence opinion to the good of politics and the people involved.

By 1972, Jerry was serving as a county commissioner of Adams County, Colorado. I am not sure whether this stint as a public official made him more sympathetic or critical of elected officials, but since then Jerry has served in a variety of non-elected positions, quietly and effectively making a difference in people's lives.

Jerry served for 10 years as Chief of Staff to U.S. Senator Jim Sasser of Tennessee, earning the respect of fellow staff and Members of the Senate alike. Jerry was the guy who knew all of the ins and outs of an issue, and the person who people turned to when they were not exactly sure just where to be in a controversy.

After promising himself and his family a quieter life outside the beltway,