

had performed 45,000 abortions. He said that, for a number of reasons, parents ought to be involved in these decisions, and that parental notification laws are correct, and that the pro-abortion forces undermine their own efforts and their credibility when they oppose them. He pointed out that children should be consulting with their families for these kinds of situations.

And from a medical point of view, he pointed out that when a child is transported a long distance to a medical center to have an abortion, perhaps she has not had good adult advice as to whether or not that is a good doctor or clinic. When she goes there, she is then returned at a long distance to the home of her parents. Many times, he noted, there are complications. Parents need to be aware and to be watching the child to help her if complications occur. And he said return visits to the abortion clinic for checkups are little done when a child has a long distance to go back to the clinic. So for health and medical reasons, he believes that children ought to consult with and have the approval of their parents before they obtain abortions. Of course the laws of each of those States—and the Supreme Court rulings—require that there be an option for a child who is pregnant to go to court and get an order for an abortion without notifying a parent. So there is an option, required by the Supreme Court decisions.

Mrs. Farley testified that her daughter was taken out of state for an abortion by one Rosa Marie Hartford. Ms. Hartford was actually the mother of the 18-year-old young man whose statutory rape of the then-12-year-old girl is what caused the pregnancy. In other words, the woman was trying to cover up the criminal activity of her son. The son later pled guilty to statutory rape.

The attorney general for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania testified concerning his efforts to prosecute Mrs. Hartford under state law for interfering with the custody of a minor. Those efforts may or may not ultimately prove successful. Attorney General Fischer testified concerning the difficulties of pursuing such a case under state law, and strongly recommended passage of this bill.

This issue does not involve a few isolated cases. An attorney for the Center for Reproductive Law and Policy, has acknowledged this. Attorney Kathryn Kolbert stated, and I quote: "There are thousands of minors who cross state lines for an abortion every year and who need assistance from adults to do that." We have seen several examples of abortion clinics which openly place advertisements in the yellow pages in nearby states that have parental consent statutes. These advertisements proudly proclaim: "No parental consent."

Thus, these clinics are openly encouraging the evasion of state laws, and something needs to be done about it. Because of the interstate nature of this problem, a Federal solution is required.

This bill is constitutional. As I have stated earlier, the Supreme Court has upheld the types of state parental notification and consent laws that this bill would help to bolster. It is specious to suggest that this bill would unduly burden the right to an abortion. The bill does nothing more than prohibit the evasion of constitutional state statutes.

This bill is a valid and appropriate exercise of Congress's authority under the Commerce Clause.

I was a Federal prosecutor, Mr. President, for nearly 15 years. A long-term Federal statute is the Mann Act. It has for many years—many years back, I think, since 1913—prohibited the interstate transportation of women or girls across State lines for prostitution or other immoral purposes. That is a Federal law. The constitutionality of the Mann Act has been upheld by the Supreme Court since the early 1900s. It is a very close analogy to the Child Custody Protection Act, which would preclude the transporting of minor girls across State lines to evade State parental involvement laws. Any constitutional objections to this bill, in my opinion, would be without merit and would certainly fail.

Also, this bill is very narrow in its scope. It does not prohibit interstate abortions. It does not invalidate any state laws. It does not establish a right to parental consent for residents of any state that does not already have a parental consent law. It doesn't even attempt to regulate the activities of the pregnant minor herself. It only reaches the conduct of outside parties who wrongfully usurp the rights of parents that are guaranteed by state law.

Some suggest that the bill should be narrowed further, to exempt the interference with parental rights, if the adult is a relative of the child, they could interfere with the parents' rights. I would disagree with that.

This bill would not prevent the minor from seeking counsel from an aunt or grandmother or anyone else. It would prohibit aunts and grandmothers from violating the rights of the child's parents by secretly driving the youngster to another state for an abortion without telling the parents. I personally wonder whether it might be worse to have a grandmother or an aunt interjecting themselves in between the parent and the child, than to have some stranger do it. The result is the same. It is the same. It is the parent who has the responsibility, who brought the child into the world, and who has raised the child. The destructive impact on the family could be greater in that case.

In any event, the grandmother isn't the parent, and the aunt isn't the parent; and neither relative nor stranger should have the right to circumvent parental involvement statutes.

If a well-meaning grandmother wants to be helpful, in most situations she should encourage the child to confide in her parents. In the rare cir-

cumstances where that would not be appropriate, and the child is intent on obtaining an abortion, the judicial bypass procedure could be used.

That is, a child could go to a court, and the abortion could be authorized by the judge. The child could go to court in those circumstances.

In summary, this bill is narrowly crafted, it is well written, it is necessary, and it is constitutional. The House of Representatives passed this bill with a strong bipartisan majority of 276 to 150. I urge my colleagues to do likewise.

We need to ensure this bill receives a vote on the merits. We are apparently going to have to invoke cloture to even get it up for a vote. There is a strong determination—I consider it an extreme commitment—to support anything that favors abortion by too many Members of this body.

This is a reasonable bill. This is a fair bill. It is an appropriate action by the Congress of the United States involving interstate commerce. As a Federal prosecutor, I prosecuted those who transported stolen motor vehicles—ITSMV, Interstate Transportation of Stolen Motor Vehicles, stolen property, lots of those kinds of cases. This is one type of case that is quite appropriate for us to legislate on.

I hope that every Member of this body will vote for it. It ought to pass overwhelmingly. It is good public policy.

I, again, congratulate Senator Abraham for his determined and skilled legislative leadership in crafting and presenting this outstanding piece of legislation.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Wednesday, September 9, 1998, the federal debt stood at \$5,548,476,705,773.12 (Five trillion, five hundred forty-eight billion, four hundred seventy-six million, seven hundred five thousand, seven hundred seventy-three dollars and twelve cents).

One year ago, September 9, 1997, the federal debt stood at \$5,408,443,000,000 (Five trillion, four hundred eight billion, four hundred forty-three million).

Five years ago, September 9, 1993, the federal debt stood at \$4,389,196,000,000 (Four trillion, three hundred eighty-nine billion, one hundred ninety-six million).

Ten years ago, September 9, 1988, the federal debt stood at \$2,600,050,000,000 (Two trillion, six hundred billion, fifty million).

Fifteen years ago, September 9, 1983, the federal debt stood at \$1,354,932,000,000 (One trillion, three hundred fifty-four billion, nine hundred thirty-two million) which reflects a debt increase of more than \$4 trillion—\$4,193,544,705,773.12 (Four trillion, one hundred ninety-three billion, five hundred forty-four million, seven hundred five thousand, seven hundred seventy-three dollars and twelve cents) during the past 15 years.

DOING THE SENATE'S BUSINESS— THE NEED FOR A TWO-TRACK SYSTEM

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the Majority Leader has told us that there is no time left in this session to work on legislation which can improve the quality of life for most Americans. But there is time. As the Minority Leader has noted several times, there is time every evening after the day's work is completed when we can work a second shift.

The so-called "two-track" system has not been an uncommon practice in the Senate. More than a dozen times in the last 13 years, this body has worked well into the evening on legislation separate from that which it worked on during the day in an effort to get the job done. I ask unanimous consent that the 14 excerpts from floor speeches which refer to this practice be printed in the RECORD. These are examples initiated by Republicans and Democrats, majority and minority.

We have the opportunity to pass legislation which will make a positive impact on the lives of millions of Americans. We should not let this chance pass us by.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[144 Cong Rec S 5400, *S5400; May 22, 1998]

Mr. LOTT. I do want to emphasize, the nuclear waste issue we intend to double track. That is one where we can take an action and then come off of that and go, then, to other legislation, the tobacco legislation. And it will take a period of days to get through the process we have to go on, on nuclear waste. But that is not intended to take the place of either the tobacco bill or the Department of Defense authorization bill. It will be double tracking as we go forward.

[141 Cong Rec S 12676, *S12677; Sept. 6, 1995
(Legislative day of Sept. 5, 1995)]

Mr. DOLE. I think we have now completed action on seven appropriations bills. There are no other appropriations bills now ready for consideration. We may try a two-track system—I will discuss that with the Democratic leader—so we can keep abreast of the House on appropriations bills and have all appropriations bills in the President's hands by October 1.

So it may mean some late, late, late evenings. But we will try to accommodate major concerns that many Senators have from time to time.

[141 Cong Rec S 5303, *S5303; April 6, 1995
(Legislative day of April 5)]

Mr. DASCHLE. What I hope we might be able to do, perhaps, is to maybe run two tracks, get some debate and offer some of

these amendments. We could maybe work out some short time agreements and have a good debate, rather than just putting the Senate in a quorum call, and then work simultaneously to see if [*S5304] we might not be able to address some of these concerns.

[135 Cong Rec S 13040, *S13040; October 12, 1989 (Legislative day of Sept. 18)]

Mr. MITCHELL. That is precisely my intention; that if we reach 2 p.m. Wednesday without having completed action on the flag amendment, we will return to that following the presentation of arguments by the impeachment managers and Judge Hastings and his counsel on Wednesday, back to it on Thursday and continue on a double track, so to speak, until such time as we do complete action on that.

[134 Cong Rec S 5258, *S5258; April 29, 1988
(Legislative day of April 28)]

Mr. BYRD. So, at least until next Wednesday, I will say that the Senate will be on other very important business, the DOD authorization bill. If that bill is not finished by the conclusion of business on Tuesday, and by that time it appears that the Senate is ready to go forward on the treaty, then Senator NUNN has indicated a willingness to either set the DOD authorization bill aside and take it up following the action on the treaty or, as I suggested to Senator DOLE, Senator NUNN, Senator BOREN, and Senator PELL, perhaps for a day or two we could proceed on a two-track basis, get work started on the treaty, and finish the work on the DOD authorization bill. We can make that decision as of next Wednesday.

[134 Cong Rec S 2818, *S2833; March 23, 1988
(Legislative day of March 21)]

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, there has been discussion in the past, and it was certainly the majority leader's duty to move legislation, when it was felt several times that there would be a filibuster unless the majority leader felt it necessary to file a motion for cloture on the first day that the bill came up. This is not a criticism. That happened several times. We did our business. When that came up, we had a double track. We handled the immigration bill and we handled the oversight legislation on intelligence. We did our business. There was nothing inappropriate about that. But finally there were those who said we are unable to put in nongermane amendments.

[134 Cong Rec S 1678, *S1679; March 2, 1988]

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I would inform the majority leader that I think the aspect of the cloture vote does impel us to do our work, and we are going to do that. I think it would be good if the majority leader and I visited about what we visited about last night. I think perhaps we might be in a position to utilize the services of the new committee, the ad hoc committee, for the referral of a sense-of-the-Senate resolution which could be discussed today, and I would like to visit with the majority leader about that. We have been asked to appoint one new member. I am ready to do that. That group would then deal with the rules issues that we discussed. Then we could go on a double track for the intelligence authorization and then get to Price-Anderson and be dealing with it and have it as the pending item of business when we return, because it is a very important piece of legislation.

[133 Cong Rec S 8426; June 23, 1987]

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, later this afternoon I hope to offer the omnibus trade bill. I would like to get it before the Senate later today for opening statements. On tomorrow, then, following the conference report on the budget action, the Senate would return, probably, to the trade legislation. I remind

all Senators that I indicated last week that we will be operating on at least a two-track system here for the next few days. The campaign finance reform bill will still be around. The trade legislation will be up. We will have to take action on the conference report on the budget.

[133 Cong Rec S 8493; June 23, 1987]

Mr. BYRD. The Senate will operate on a two-track system, under the consent order that was entered. It gives the majority leader at any time the consent to go to the trade legislation—the omnibus bill, or the bill that was reported out of the Finance Committee. I have chosen to proceed with the omnibus approach. That was the approach that was discussed for months, and committee chairmen have acted accordingly. They have been dutiful in reporting out the legislation.

So, beginning on tomorrow, there will be longer days and shorter nights, in contrast to the natural seasons of the year.

[133 Cong Rec S 8363; June 19, 1987]

Mr. BYRD. So by the middle of next week, certainly, I expect us to be on the trade legislation. We will have a two-track system. We will work on trade during the early part of the day up into the midafternoon or a little later than midafternoon. Then we will go to campaign financing reform. I would like to retain the flexibility to switch that mode, but that is my present plan, to go with trade first, then campaign financing reform. We can shift that, of course.

[131 Cong Rec S 14042; October 24, 1985
(Legislative day of October 24, 1985)]

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, if the majority leader will yield, is it the majority leader's intention to stay with the farm bill until it is disposed of or to lay it aside, double track it with other measures? I do not mean to ask for a hard and fast answer. But is it the overall intention to dispose of the farm bill on a priority basis over other pending legislation which we have half done or partially done.

Mr. DOLE. The Senator is correct. It might be, if we can reach an agreement on reconciliation, we might have to interrupt discussion of the farm bill, say, Wednesday or Thursday of next week, and it could result if we cannot get an agreement, we could have 100 and some votes under the reconciliation process, but I do believe that with that one caveat, and again there is always a possibility that the textile amendment should come off reconciliation, there might be some agreement to offer it to some other bill, but the general intention is to finish the farm bill, and I know it is very important to farmers just as it was in July when we tried to bring it up.

[131 Cong Rec S 13169; October 10, 1985
(Legislative day of Sept. 30, 1985)]

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, as I have indicated, we will have a pro forma session tomorrow, convening at 9:30 a.m.

On Tuesday, October 15, 1985, the Senate will convene at 10 a.m. Under the standing order, the two leaders will be recognized for 10 minutes each. There is a special order in favor of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER] for 15 minutes. That will be followed by morning business, not to extend beyond the hour of 11 a.m.

Mr. President, following morning business, the Senate will turn to any appropriations bills which have been cleared. No votes will occur during the Tuesday session.

Mr. President, if we can work it out between the majority leader and the minority leader, I hope we can double track with appropriations bills in the morning and reconciliation in the afternoon. We have gotten behind, not just because of the debt limit but other internal controversies over appropriations bills.