

While many of the State court decisions have relied on *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*, that case does not reach the question of the constitutionality of forbidding the killing of a partially delivered baby either. However, under the *Casey* analysis, an abortion restriction is unconstitutional only, only if it creates an "undue burden," on the legal right to abortion. Banning a single dangerous procedure such as we are doing in this case, when there are other alternatives available—which is true—should not constitute a burden under this *Casey* analysis.

Doctors, those who are for, as well as those, some of whom are against this legislation—agree that partial-birth abortion is never medically necessary to protect a mother's health or future fertility, and is never the only option. Over 30 legal scholars who have looked at this question agree that the United States Supreme Court is unlikely to interpret a postviability health exception to require the Government to allow a procedure that gives zero weight to the life of a partially born child and is itself a dangerous procedure.

The bottom line is that there is no substantive difference between a child in the process of being born and that same child if she is born. No difference, really, between a child that is in the process of being born and a child that is born. A current illustration, I think, is very helpful. This is a true story, one that occurred in our minority leader's home State, South Dakota.

On January 5 of this year, Sarah Bartels was pregnant with twins. She was 23 weeks into her pregnancy. Doctors were unable to delay the birth of one of the twins, Sandra, who was born at 23 weeks old. Sandra weighed 1 pound, 2 ounces—23 weeks.

Mr. President, 88 days later Sandra's sister Stephanie was born. Both children are alive and well today. Yet Stephanie was not a "legal person," and could have been the victim of a partial-birth abortion any time after that 23-week period.

Stephanie's life had zero worth until she was completely born, though Sandra was alive and well outside the same womb that held her sister.

Mr. President, the delivery of 80 percent of a child—the child is almost all the way out—a living baby certainly should have some value, some rights, some respect under our law. There is no moral justification for killing a live, partially delivered baby using a procedure that is neither medically necessary nor safer than childbirth. I believe we must make it the national policy to prohibit the partial-birth abortion procedure.

My friend, HENRY HYDE, who you quoted and cited a few moments ago, Mr. President, is one of the most eloquent—the most eloquent really—defenders of human rights in this country today, one of the most eloquent defenders of human rights, frankly, who has ever been in this country. Henry Hyde

likes to say in defending these powerless humans, we are "loving those who can't love us back." I think he is absolutely right.

I will add the phrase, "those who can't love back" includes not just fetuses in the womb, but also the future generations who will live in this country and the moral climate we are choosing to build for them.

The vote we cast tomorrow morning will help determine, Mr. President, that moral climate. Banning partial-birth abortion is the just, it is the right thing to do, and we should do it now.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

Mr. SANTORUM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, first, again, I thank the Senator from Ohio for his excellent comments and particularly his latter focus on the legal issues that were not brought up earlier. I had not had the opportunity, and neither did anybody else, to focus attention on why this particular legislation is, in fact, constitutional and that should not be a reason to not vote for this legislation. An excellent job done.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Wednesday, September 16, 1998, the federal debt stood at \$5,510,133,012,971.17 (Five trillion, five hundred ten billion, one hundred thirty-three million, twelve thousand, nine hundred seventy-one dollars and seventeen cents).

One year ago, September 16, 1997, the federal debt stood at \$5,391,866,000,000 (Five trillion, three hundred ninety-one billion, eight hundred sixty-six million).

Five years ago, September 16, 1993, the federal debt stood at \$4,388,882,000,000 (Four trillion, three hundred eighty-eight billion, eight hundred eighty-two million).

Ten years ago, September 16, 1988, the federal debt stood at \$2,597,622,000,000 (Two trillion, five hundred ninety-seven billion, six hundred twenty-two million).

Fifteen years ago, September 16, 1983, the federal debt stood at \$1,354,702,000,000 (One trillion, three hundred fifty-four billion, seven hundred two million) which reflects a debt increase of more than \$4 trillion—\$4,155,431,012,971.17 (Four trillion, one hundred fifty-five billion, four hundred thirty-one million, twelve thousand, nine hundred seventy-one dollars and seventeen cents) during the past 15 years.

SATELLITE COMPULSORY LICENSE REFORM PROCESS AND S. 1720 CHAIRMAN'S MARK

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am glad to stand with the distinguished Major-

ity Leader and the distinguished chairman of the Commerce Committee to explain how we plan to proceed with respect to reform of the copyright compulsory license governing the retransmission of broadcast television signals by satellite carriers. Let me thank them for their interest in these important issues and their cooperation in this process. The Majority Leader has been particularly helpful in facilitating a process allowing for a joint reform package from our two committees.

Mr. President, the Judiciary Committee has been working on these issues for more than 2 years. We have always recognized that some of the reforms we need to undertake in relation to the compulsory copyright license would require reforms in the communications law which has traditionally been dealt with in the Commerce Committee. I am glad that we have been able to work out a process whereby we can move a bill to the floor that will be the joint work product, and thus using the joint expertise, of both the Judiciary and Commerce Committees.

We will proceed in the Judiciary Committee by working on a bill on the subject that has already been referred to the Judiciary Committee, S. 1720, which Senator LEAHY and I introduced earlier in this Congress. We will mark up a Chairman's mark substitute amendment of that bill which will cover the copyright amendments, including the granting and extension of the local and distant signal licenses, respectively, as well as the copyright rates for each of those licenses. Other important reforms include eliminating the current waiting period for cable subscribers before getting satellite service, and postponing the date of the enforcement of the so-called white area rules for a brief period. As of today, a large number of satellite subscribers who have been found to be ineligible for distant network signals will be turned off in early October. Our bill will delay any such terminations to allow subscribers and satellite carriers to adopt other service packages, including local service packages where available, to work with local affiliates to work out a coverage compromise, and to allow the FCC to review the rules governing the eligibility for the reception of distant network signals. The text of this Chairman's mark will be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks and is supported and cosponsored by the chairman of the Commerce Committee, Senator MCCAIN, as well as Senators LEAHY, DEWINE, and KOHL.

While the Judiciary Committee works on these copyright reforms, our colleagues in the Commerce Committee will be working on related communications amendments regarding such important areas such as the must-carry and retransmission consent requirements for satellite carriers upon which the copyright licenses will be conditioned, and the FCC's distant signal eligibility process. Chairman